

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

JAN 5 1935

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLVIII

DECEMBER, 1934

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	205	REVIEWS (continued) :	
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE 'LEUCIPPIDES'		<i>Greek Particles</i> (Denniston). W. L. LORIMER	221
PAPYRUS. J. A. DAVISON	205	Aristoteles ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ (Gudeman).	
NOTE ON PLATO Charmides 153B. K. W.		C. G. HARDIE	223
LUCKHURST	207	C. Lucilii Saturnarum Reliquiae (Terzaghi).	
THREE NOTES ON ARISTOTLE, <i>Ethics</i> , BOOK III.		C. J. FORDYCE	225
R. HACKFORTH	208	T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura (Martin).	
NOTE ON A DECREE FROM MYLASA. A.		L. H. G. GREENWOOD	226
WILHELM	210	La Rivolta di Catilina (Amato). M. CARY	227
TWO NOTES ON CICERO, <i>De Senectute</i> . W. S.		The Priapea and Ovid (Thomason). J. WIGHT	
MAGUINNESS	211	DUFF	227
NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT. R. L. DUN-		Vitruvius on Architecture, II (Granger).	
BABIN	212	D. S. ROBERTSON	228
XENOPHON, <i>Hellenica</i> I. vi. 32. ROBERT		Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik	
QUIRK	214	(Friedrich). W. F. J. KNIGHT	229
ARISTOTLE, <i>N.E.</i> I. vi. 1, 1096A 14. H.		Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus (Eriksson).	
RACKHAM	214	E. C. MARCHANT	230
A PAPYRUS CODEX AND AN EARLY EXAMPLE		Ptolemaios und Porphyrios über die Musik	
OF 'QUATERNIO.' A. SOUTER	214	(Düring). J. F. MOUNTFORD	231
REVIEWS :		Claudian : <i>Etudes sur sa Poésie et son Temps</i>	
<i>Staaten, Völker, Männer, aus der Geschichte</i>		and <i>Invectives contre Eutrope</i> (Fargues);	
<i>des Altertums</i> (Kornemann). A. F. GILES	215	Claudian : <i>The Rape of Proserpine in Eng-</i>	
<i>Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum</i> . Yougoslavie,		<i>lish Verse</i> (Pope). W. H. SEMPLE	232
Fasc. I (Hoffiller). W. A. HEURTLEY	216	Select Letters of St. Jerome, with an English	
<i>A Handbook of Greek Literature</i> (Rose);		translation (Wright). A. SOUTER	233
<i>Griechische Literaturgeschichte</i> , 2. Bd.		A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the	
(Geffcken). T. A. SINCLAIR	217	Middle Ages (Raby). J. WIGHT DUFF	236
<i>Die Theogonie des Hesiodos</i> (Schwenn). H. J.		SHORT REVIEWS	237
ROSE	219	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	243
<i>Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen</i>		BOOKS RECEIVED	246
<i>Lyrrik</i> (Breitenbach). J. D. DENNISTON	220	INDEXES	247

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, c/o The Triangle Offices. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. R. M. Rattenbury and Professor T. B. L. Webster) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

Volume X. The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.—A.D. 70

Edited by S. A. COOK, F. E. ADCOCK, and M. P. CHARLESWORTH

With 25 maps, plans, and tables. 37s. 6d. net

Volume of Plates IV. Illustrating Vols IX and X of the History.

Prepared by C. T. SELTMAN. 12s. 6d. net

LITERARY CRITICISM IN ANTIQUITY

A Sketch of its Development. By J. W. H. ATKINS

Vol. I. Greek. 10s. net. Vol. II. Græco-Roman. 15s. net

'Professor Atkins has done a public service. . . . A work which is likely to be eminently useful. This book is remarkably full and comprehensive. Every one of Professor Atkins's chapters is illuminating. But it is in Longinus that he finds his most congenial theme; and the section on "the sublime," I might venture to call nearly perfect.'

E. E. KELLETT in *The New Statesman and Nation*

ment and
ress upon
national
g; (c) to
to create

the annual
fee of 5s.
proceedings
Classical
Classical
scription
n is paid
n annual

rer, Mr.
sent to
the Hon.
T. B. L.
es—viz.,
Anglia,
er, Nor-
Sheffield,
nerset.

ESS

Y

TH

ry.

Y

tly
sor
ial

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1934

NOTES AND NEWS

The September number of the twenty-first volume of *IPIΣ*, the news-sheet of the Classical Association of Victoria, contains an appreciation by Professor T. G. Tucker of the late Dr. Leeper, well known outside Australia as a translator of Juvenal. He went to Australia from Dublin and Oxford, and as Classical Master at the Melbourne Grammar School and afterwards as Warden of Trinity College he fought hard for the cause of humanistic studies in Australia, and in 1912 founded the Classical Association of Victoria, 'which he proudly claimed to be the largest of its kind in the Empire.' The long-continued success of *IPIΣ*, which crosses the ocean in all the brightness of its name, is itself a monument to Dr. Leeper. The same number prints a résumé of a lecture by Professor R. L. Dunbabin on 'The Follies of the Wise.' 'No system of education can create common sense in those who, like most passmen, are born without it. . . . The contributors to' [one of the organs of the Classical Association] 'are among the most eminent scholars of the realm, yet, in a single number . . . some supported fantastic suggestions for the teaching of Greek and Latin; and others let imagination

run riot in the interpretation of texts. Some decried the reformed pronunciation; some advocated the reading of medieval Latin in schools, or urged that a collection of bright Greek anecdotes be read instead of a book of the *Anabasis* "with its weary waste of parasangs." Others wrote dreadful grammars with antediluvian lumber of gender rhymes, snippets of advice, and declensions strung out through the whole book; while champions of the Direct Method fell into the pit with their jargon of modern conversation, which is not Latin.' And more to the same effect. Professor Dunbabin combines the fresh outlook of a visitor from Mars with some very shrewd criticism.

The October number quotes from Sir H. Stuart Jones an acknowledgement of valuable aid received from Dr. Leeper in the revision of Liddell and Short.

The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1934, will contain summaries and appreciations of recent work on Greek Literature, Latin Literature, Greek History, Roman History, Greek and Roman Religion, Ancient Philosophy, Greek Palaeography, Italian Archaeology.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE 'LEUCIPPIDES' PAPYRUS.

THE two lyric poems of which fragments are contained in the papyrus discovered by Breccia at Oxyrhynchus in 1928 and first published in 1932 by A. Vogliano for the Società Italiana per la Ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto (*P.S.I.* x, 1932, No. 1181, pp. 169-179) are usually ascribed (e.g. by H. J. M. Milne in *Journ. Eg. Arch.* xix, 1933, p. 69) to 'Bacchylides (?)', and Bruno Snell has printed them as Nos. 60 and 61 of the 'Fragmenta Dubia' of Bacchylides in his recent edition of that author (Teubner,

1934).¹ The grounds for this ascription do not seem very convincing (Snell indeed remarks on p. 48* that it is 'maxime dubium an Bacchylidis sint');

¹ To the references given by Snell in his bibliographical note on fr. 60 (p. 110), add: A. Severyns, *Bacchylide* (Liège, 1933), pp. 142, 151, and the review of this book by C. M. Bowra in *C.R.* xlvii, 1933, p. 240. G. Coppola's theory will be found in his *Introduzione a Pindaro* (Rome, 1931); but I cannot give the page-reference, as no copy of the book is available to me. I owe my knowledge of Coppola's work to Mr. Bowra, who was so kind as to read the present note in typescript.

and it is the purpose of this note to put forward evidence in support of the suggestion already made by G. Coppola and C. M. Bowra that Simonides has a better claim to the poems than his nephew¹.

The first of the two poems (Snell's fr. 60) deals with a party of women, who after sailing away from Troy as refugees have at last through the interposition of some god or hero reached a place where they can settle. *ἀμετέρας* in v. 7, *ἰχόμεθα* in v. 9, and *ἦμεναι* in v. 11 show that the lamentations of the women were given in direct speech. It happens that there is a fragment of Simonides which almost exactly fits this context. In his essay on Exile (Ch. 8, p. 602 C-D), Plutarch writes: *ἀν τις τούτων* (i.e. the considerations which he has just put forward) *μνημονεύη φρένας ἔχων καὶ μὴ παντάσῃσι τετυφωμένους αἰρήσεται καὶ νῆσον οἰκεῖν φυχὰς γενόμενος Γύραρον ἢ Κίναρον σκληρὰν ἄκαρπον καὶ φυτεύεσθαι κακὴν οὐκ ἄθυμῶν οὐδ' ὀδυρόμενος οὐδὲ λέγων ἐκείνα τὰ τῶν παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ γυναικῶν· ἴσχει δέ με πορφυρέας ἀλὸς ἀμφιταρασσομένας ὀρυμαγδός*. Here we have evidence that Simonides wrote a poem about women in exile, and that the poem included at least one lament in direct speech. The context and the wording of the quotation further suggest that the women have already reached the island where they are to live: though Simonides's words could bear the interpretation that they are still on the sea.

These points of similarity between Plutarch's quotation and the papyrus provide good ground for the suggestion that Bacchyl. fr. 60 Snell is the poem by Simonides from which Plutarch is quoting; and strong corroboration of this hypothesis is furnished by the metrical evidence. Assuming (as we have a perfect right to do) that there is synizesis in *πορφυρέας*, *ἴσχει δέ με πορφυρέας* is a Telesillean; v. 11 of fr. 60 *ὕπὸ πένθεσιν ἦμεναι* is a Telesillean with

resolution of the first syllable²: while *ἀλὸς ἀμφιταρασσομένας*, however it is described (it looks like 3 Anapaests, but it is generally held that Anapaests must be written by dipodies), exactly corresponds to v. 12 *κρύβεντι γὰρ ἐμ πολέμῳ· ὀρυμαγδός* should correspond to the first syllables of v. 13 *διμένακα*., which Snell regards as corrupt, and though Mr. Milne has proposed the restoration *Δὲ μὲν ἄκαι[ρον] λιπαρῶ*, the apparently unexampled use of *λιπαρός* as an epithet of Zeus makes it hard to accept this reading without further evidence. If Mr. Milne is right, the only way to find an exact responsion to *ὀρυμαγδός* is to assume that Plutarch has omitted either a word equivalent to one long syllable (e.g. *βαρύς*) or a whole line before *ὀρυμαγδός*, which will then correspond either to *μὲν ἄκαιρον* or to v. 14 *κίχεται λ[ι]*. Alternatively, we must suppose that we have here an Ionic a minore corresponding to a Choriamb, a license to which the nearest parallel seems to be in Simonides fr. 13 Diehl,³ where v. 7 *γαλαθηνῶ* corresponds to 21 -αλέον ἔπος (υυυυ-), an impossible resolution in an Ionic a minore at this period, but a possible equivalent either for a Choriamb, as in Anacreon 52, 53 Diehl, or for an Iamb). A similar Simonidean responsion is that of fr. 4. 21-κα δ' οὐδὲ θε- (Ionic a majore) to 29 τοῖσιν (or τοῖσί τ') αἰσχυρά (Trochee).

It may be objected that Plutarch's lament is in the singular, while that of the papyrus is in the plural. Plutarch, however, says explicitly *γυναικῶν*, and it is only necessary to refer to Soph. *El.* 1058-1069 to see that choral lyric allows changes of number in the first person to occur in the course of a few lines. In any case, there is evidence that there would have been plenty of room in the new poem for 'solo' laments to precede the lament by all the women together. In the last 31

² In an article on 'Double Scansion in Early Greek Lyric' (*C.Q.* xxviii, 1934, pp. 183-189), I have tried to show that the Telesillean is a catalectic form of a popular dimeter (Ionic a majore, Trochee) used by Alcman (fr. 1, where we find v. 69 *ἰανσλεφάρ*. (υυυ-υυ) responding to the normal forms vv. 41 *ἦ ὦρ' ἄλιον*, 55 *τό τ' ἀργύρι-*).

³ I have discussed the metre of this fragment in a paper which will shortly be published in *C.Q.*

¹ Neither of Simonides's advocates has published any reasons for his belief. Mr. Bowra now tells me that his view was based '1. on the style, which is too simple for Bacchylides, and 2. on the Plutarch passage which you quote.' I believe the metrical argument to be entirely my own.

lines of fr. 60 (the only lines of which enough has been preserved to make a judgment possible) there is no respon- sion of sufficient length to indicate that we have any part of a strophe. As fr. 60 is certainly the end of the poem, these 31 lines comprise antistrophe (probably incomplete) and epode. This, in view of the proportion normally pre- served between strophe and epode¹, requires a triad of at least 45-50 lines². This length is unusual, but not unprece- dented, as is proved by the examples of Pindar's Sixth Paean (triad 70 lines, strophe and antistrophe each 23, epode 24) and Bacchylides's 'Hίθεοι (triad 66 lines, strophe 23, epode 20) and 'Ιώ (triad 51 lines, strophe 18, epode 15). Snell's division of Bacchyl. fr. 4, the Paean of which he has greatly increased

our knowledge by his brilliant identi- fication of Blass-Süss's fr. 4 with the end of *Ox. Pap.* 426 (*Hermes* lxvii (1932) pp. 1 ff.), gives a strophe of at least 20 lines (requiring a triad of at least 55); and Pindar's Dithyramb Θρασύς 'Ηρακλῆς ἡ Κέρβερος has a 19-line strophe. The two examples first quoted show that a poem could contain more than one triad of the length here postulated, Pindar's Paean having had at least three, while the 'Hίθεοι has two. Thus we are dealing with a poem which may well have con- tained upwards of 100 lines, leaving ample scope for the arrangement sug- gested above.

Another objection which may be made is that the title of the second poem ('Leucippides') fits in well with the alphabetical order of the poems in the British Museum papyrus of Bacchylides's Dithyrambs (see for ex- ample H. J. M. Milne in *C.R.* xlvii, 1933, p. 62); but it may be answered (1) that there is no evidence that the first of the two poems had a title which would put it between 'Ιώ and Λευκιπ- πίδες in alphabetical order, (2) that there is no evidence that the arrange- ment by (approximately) alphabetical order of titles was peculiar to Bacchyl- ides's Dithyrambs, and (3) that it would be a curious coincidence if a papyrus discovered at Oxyrhynchus in 1928 should fit so closely on to the end of a papyrus discovered in a tomb at Meir in 1896 (see Snell's edition, p. 6*) as this objection would require.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

NOTE ON PLATO *CHARMIDES* 153B.

Ὀλίγον δὲ πρὶν ἡμᾶς ἀπιέναι μάχῃ ἐγεγόνει ἐν τῇ Ποτειδαίᾳ.

What battle is referred to here? Some writers, apparently identifying it with the battle of *Symph.* 220D, E, have taken it to be that which took place before Potidaea in 432 B.C. (according to the usual chronology) before the two and a half years' siege of the city. This may well be true of the *Symposium* battle. Unless, however, Plato's his- torical allusions are never to be taken

seriously, it appears to be impossible to extend this identification to the battle referred to in the *Charmides*. In the first place, if this battle is that of 432, Socrates' arrival in Athens, mentioned at the opening of the dialogue, must have been at the end of 432 or very early in 431. For he came to Athens soon after the battle (ὀλίγον πρὶν ἡμᾶς ἀπιέναι μάχῃ ἐγεγόνει). But there are grave difficulties about this. (1) The two corps of hoplites which took part

in the battle, a first of 1,000 men and a second of 2,000, both went out in 432. Socrates would therefore have been away less than a year. But in 153A he says that he has been away a long time (*διὰ χρόνου*), and makes this more definite by saying in 154B that though, when he left, Charmides was a *παῖς*, now *εὖ μάλα ἂν ἤδη μεράκιον εἴη*—a change which indicates an interval not of months but of years. (2) Thucydides (II 31. 2 and 58. 3) states quite definitely that the 3,000 troops remained at Potidaea until the end of the siege, so that, if Socrates returned to Athens in 432, it must have been independently. But Alcibiades' language in *Symp.* 219E-220E implies that Socrates was with the army throughout the campaign, and he explicitly mentions his presence at Potidaea in the depth of winter. If however he did return temporarily and independently (and the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατοπέδου*, though it probably means 'from where we had been encamped, or campaigning,' might certainly imply that he left the army behind him, as it does at *Theaet.* 142A and *Laws* XII 943A, etc.), it must have been on some urgent mission. Yet we find him on the morning after his arrival going off gaily (*ἀσμένως*), as if everything was over, to his 'wonted conversations'—and no question asked as to such an unexpected appearance in the city.

In the second place, Plato's description of the battle does not tally with Thucydides'. Plato calls it *πάνυ ἰσχυρά*, and he says that in it many *τῶν γνωρίμων* had died. On the other hand, Thucydides (I. 63) says *διὰ τάχους ἡ νίκη τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐγένετο*, and he estimates the Athenian losses at 150 hoplites (out of 3,000) and one general, Callias.

But if the battle referred to is not that of 432, what battle is it? Doubtless there were many attempts to rush

the city (such as those described in Thuc. II. 58), and one of these might possibly be referred to. But this would still leave at least some of the difficulties unremoved. The whole problem however is solved by referring the allusion to the battle of Spartolus in the summer of 429 (Thuc. II. 79), when 2,000 Athenians under Xenophon son of Euripides, and two other generals, were heavily defeated. Now Xenophon and two other generals were in command of the 3,000 Athenians at Potidaea when it capitulated, and it would appear that the first 1,000 Athenians to be sent north returned home soon after the siege, while the second body, of 2,000, to which Socrates probably belonged, remained in the neighbourhood to consolidate the position, and were the troops involved in this defeat. This battle was indeed *πάνυ ἰσχυρά*, and the Athenians lost 430 men (nearly a quarter of their forces) and all their generals. After the battle they took refuge in Potidaea, and when they had recovered their dead they retired to Athens with the remnant of the army. All this (and particularly the retirement of the whole force to Athens after the defeat) suits exactly the language of the *Charmides*, and the phrase *ἐν τῇ Ποτειδαίᾳ* is no objection, since Spartolus was near Potidaea, and *ἐν* is regularly used (like our English 'at'), particularly in the case of battles, to indicate mere proximity: v. Kühner *Gr. Gr.* II. 1. 464 and cf. Th. 4. 5 *καί τι καὶ αὐτοὺς ὁ στρατὸς (τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων) ἔτι ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ὦν ἐπέσχευ*: Pl. *Mx.* 241B *οἱ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχῆσαντες*: etc. It was natural enough for Plato to locate the battle by the better known of the two places and the centre of the whole operations—just as we might refer to a battle anywhere in a neighbouring district during the late war as being 'at Salonica.'

K. W. LUCKHURST.

University of Edinburgh.

THREE NOTES ON ARISTOTLE, *ETHICS*, BOOK III.

(I) III 4B 23.

As the text stands, the words *καὶ τῷ ποιοῖ τινες εἶναι τὸ τέλος τοιόνδε τιθέμεθα* must be intended as part of the

reason for the statement *ἐκούσιοι εἰσιν αἱ ἀρεταί*. But a doubt should arise whether they can be so intended in view of the fact that the imaginary

objector (the *τις* of III4A 31) has expressed in the words *ὁποῖός ποθ' ἑκαστός ἐστι, τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ τέλος φαίνεται αὐτῷ* an argument against the voluntariness of Vice. The relation between these two passages I hope to show in what follows. But first we must consider what interpretation must be given to the words *τῷ ποιοῖ τις εἶναι* if the sentence in which they stand is to substantiate the voluntariness of Virtue. It is plain that they can only do so if they are equivalent to *τῷ ποιάς τινος τὰς ἔξεις ἔχειν*, or *τῷ ποιοῖ τις γεγενῆσθαι* (as opposed to *πεφυκέναι*). A. will then be saying 'Virtue is voluntary, because we are part-causes of our *ἔξεις* and through having such-and-such *ἔξεις* we assume the end to be such-and-such.'

This appears to be the accepted interpretation; but it is hardly possible for this to be A.'s meaning, since the whole preceding discussion regarding the *φυσικὸν τέλος* would then be robbed of its point. I cannot doubt that the reason given in the *καὶ γάρ* sentence is one which takes account of the *φυσικὸν τέλος* thesis, and incorporates the result of the foregoing discussion of that thesis. On the current interpretation the sentence in question ignores it. For if A. means his final argument for the voluntariness of Virtue and Vice to be 'A man is at least partly self-determining in forming his *ἔξεις*, and the end he chooses is determined by the *ἔξεις* he forms', he ends by completely disregarding the problem which has occupied §§ 17-19. The point made by the imaginary objector is answered by confronting him with a dilemma; the first horn of this is 'If you allow that a man partly determines his own *ἔξεις*, then he must partly determine his own *φαντασία*, i.e. the end that appears good to him' (III4B 1-3). Now the words *καὶ γάρ τῶν ἔξεων συναίτιοι πῶς αὐτοὶ ἐσμεν, καὶ τῷ ποιοῖ τις εἶναι τὸ τέλος τοιούδε τιθέμεθα* on the current interpretation simply repeat the argument of this horn, giving it now as A.'s own final argument. But there would be no sense in making this repetition unless it had been shown in what intervened that this horn must be grasped by the

objector: and that has not been shown. On the contrary, it is the second horn that the objector is really assumed to grasp, and it is that alone which represents his true position. The argument of the second horn may be paraphrased as follows:—A man is not free to develop his character: it is determined for him from birth; the ends he chooses are due to an initial *εὐφύια* or *κακοφύια*: the *τέλος* is *φυσικόν* (III4B 3-12). The only answer that A. can find to this is to suggest that his opponent must at least allow voluntariness in respect of the *means* chosen towards the *φυσικὸν τέλος*: since otherwise he would make not only Vice wholly involuntary but Virtue also, and that (A. assumes) he would be reluctant to do. Now if the voluntariness of Virtue is admitted by the opponent to consist in this voluntary choice of means, the same voluntariness must (A. argues) hold good of Vice; in other words, granting the doctrine of the *φυσικὸν τέλος*, we still partly determine our own characters, the vicious man equally with the virtuous. That is the conclusion which A. expresses in B 21-25. But it is important to realize that the conclusion, and the whole argument, are merely dialectical: it is an argument from his opponent's premiss—the premiss of the *φυσικὸν τέλος*—which A. neither affirms nor denies.

The text as it stands, however, will not express this conclusion. What is needed is to read in l. 23 *καὶ <εἰ> τῷ ποιοῖ τις εἶναι κτλ.* The insertion of *εἰ* is supported by l. 21, where *καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ τέλει* (sc. *τῷ κακῷ ὑπάρχει τὸ δι' αὐτόν*) is a concession allowed in the case of the *κακός* precisely parallel to that allowed in l. 23 in the case of the *ἀγαθός*. The *καὶ εἰ* clauses both simply concede, dialectically, the thesis of the objector at III4A 32: *ὁποῖός ποθ' ἑκαστός ἐστι, τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ τέλος φαίνεται αὐτῷ*.

(II) III2A 28.

πῶς ἂν Σκύθαι ἄριστα πολιτεύοντο οὐδεὶς Λακεδαιμονίων βουλευέται. Both E.E. and M.M. have 'Indians' in the parallel passages (I226A 29, I189A 20). Stewart and Burnet, writing of course on the assumption that E.E. is later

than *E.N.*, suggest that the substitution reflects Alexander's Indian conquests: India had now been 'brought within the Greek horizon.' Now that Jaeger has proved *E.E.* to be earlier than *E.N.* we may argue that *E.N.* has 'Scythians' just because by 326 B.C. it would not be so impossible for Greeks to deliberate about the best government for Indians. As to *M.M.*, this is simply one of the many places where its author has copied *E.E.* rather than *E.N.* So far as such a point can carry any weight, it favours the dating of *E.N.* in the last years of A.'s life.

(III) IIII2B 28-31.

This section seems irrelevant where it stands, and ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς has no meaning (as Stewart points out). I suggest that it is a marginal note added by A. to the sentence in § 11 which ends διὰ τίνων ἔσται σκοποῦσι. Then

the meaning will be: 'Doctor, public speaker, statesman sometimes inquire about instruments to achieve their ends, sometimes about the right way to use those instruments. And similarly in all other cases, what is inquired about is sometimes the means or instrument, sometimes the manner or way of using it, or the person through whose agency we can use it.'

This is of course expressed with intolerable obscurity; but the marginal notes in a lecturer's MS. are often of a brevity sufficient to remind the lecturer of his point. The note was probably misplaced and incorporated in the text here by someone who thought that friends were mentioned as instances of *δργανα* (cf. 1099B 1).

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College,
Cambridge.

NOTE ON A DECREE FROM MYLASA.

THE badly worn first lines of a new decree of the Ὀτωρκονδέων φυλή of Mylasa, voted in honour of Διονύσιος Ἰατροκλέους, are read by the editor, *Revue archéologique* 1933 II p. 38 n. 1, as follows:

μεγαλου[ερ]ῶς καὶ εὐ[σεβ]ῶς
AIE T E N T ΤΗΣ ὁπ[ω]ς οὖν καὶ [ἡ φυλὴ τοῖς δ-]
γαθοῖς τῶ[ν] ἀν[δρ]ῶν [καὶ] δ[ε] οὐ
5 ἰας καὶ τιμ[ῆ]ς ἀπο[δ]εχομένη κα
A I N H T A Σ ἔνεκεν τοῦ πολλοῦς
T H . ἱγλοῦν βλον . [ἀγ]αθῇ τύ[χη] ἐπ[η]ν[η]σθαι]
Διονύσιον καὶ στεφανῶσαι [αὐ]τὸν χρυ[σφ] στε-
φάνῳ κτλ.

Mr. A. Laumonier rightly states: 'La lecture des premières lignes est très douteuse, mais le sens, banal, est clair.' Under such circumstances an attempt at a restoration of these lines seems to be not altogether impossible. It meets, of course, some difficulties. The left margin of the stone is evidently preserved. It is, therefore, rather strange that, according to the editor's printed copy, some of the 21 lines which the fragment contains do not finish and begin with entire syllables or words. We should expect in l. 3 not αἰ but [κ]αί, the following word, an adverb like μεγαλομερῶς καὶ εὐ[σεβ]ῶς in l. 2,

being certainly εὐεντ[εύκ]τως, sc. ἀναστρέφεται; many years ago I restored (*Archaeol.-epigraph. Mitteilungen* XX 65) in another decree of a phyle of Mylasa (Le Bas-Waddington no. 410 l. 7) the adjective: εὐέντευκτον ἑαυτὸν πᾶσιν οὐ μόν[ον] κτλ. We should also expect in l. 6 [φ]αίνητα<ι> instead of AINHΤΑΣ, and later, in l. 11, not as Mr. Laumonier reads, δίδωσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ ἑ[ω]ς [ξῆ κ]αὶ μερίδα ἐκ τῶν θυσιῶν πασῶν, but ἑ[ω]ς [ξῆ | κ]αί.

Irregularities of this kind, however, were committed by the stonemasons even in carefully engraved inscriptions and have, in some cases, been mended by a corrector; the fact was first, as far as I know, observed by the late D. Sp. Stavropoulos Ἐφημ. ἀρχ. 1895 σ. 165 in *I.G.* XII 9, 236; another case was noted by Mr. R. Herzog, *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie*, 1905 p. 983; cf. also E. Hermann, *Silbenbildung im Griechischen* (1923), p. 138, 160. Looking at the beginnings of the other lines, I think it probable that the position of the first letters in ll. 3, 6, 12 has not been exactly rendered in Mr. Laumonier's printed copy; in any case, I have felt obliged, in proposing

a restoration of the first lines of the new decree, to make them all end and begin with entire syllables or words. I have therefore added one letter in front of each of the lines 3 to 7.

These are, however, not the only difficulties presented by the published text. In l. 5 ἀπο[δ]εχομένη, sc. ἡ φυλή, seems the proper reading; cf. *Anzeiger der Wiener Akademie*, ph.-h. Kl., 1928, p. 132 ff., and 1934, p. 56, M. Holleaux, *B.C.H.* LVII 53; [κα]ῖ ἀει ου, in l. 4, might be: [κα]ῖ ἀ<ξ>ίου[s]; we should therefore expect, in l. 4 also, an accusative: [τοὺς ἀ]γαθοὺς τῶ[ν ἀ]ν[δρῶν], whereas the copy offers ἀ]γαθοῖς. In l. 7, before ζηλοῦν βίον, T TH. cannot be rightly copied or engraved; the stonecutter has committed obvious blunders, writing in l. 6 ΑΙΝΗΤΑΣ instead of [φ]αίνηται, and in l. 15 ἡ φυλή ἢ ΚΟΝΟΔΩΡΚΟΝΔΕΩΝ instead of ἡ τῶν Ὅτ(ορ)δωρκοῦδέων.

Fortunately, two lines of another decree of Mylasa, Le Bas-Waddington no. 429, to which Mr. Laumonier himself has referred but without taking advantage of it, help us not only to read the word which precedes ζηλοῦν but also to read and supply l. 4. This fragment no. 429 forms only a small part of what once was a lengthy honorary decree; not a single phrase in it seems to permit a restoration, the lines having been of considerable length. For my purpose I need only reproduce three of its twelve lines: l. 7, in order

to justify the supplement ἐ[κ τῶν νόμων], cf. Le Bas-Waddington no. 407 l. 9: ἀλειτούργητος ὦν ἐκ τῶ[ν νόμων]; and the following two lines because they contain the very words we read and need in ll. 3 and 4 of the new decree:

ἀρχὴν ἀλειτούργητος ἐ[κ τῶν νόμων]
ἀξίους ἐπισημασίας καὶ
πρὸς ἀρετὴν ζηλοῦν ΕΙΟ

Evidently ll. 8 and 9 belong to a sentence similar to that which, in the new decree, is introduced by ὅπως. For ἐπισημασία cf. ἀποδοχῆς καὶ ἐπισημασίας I.G. II² 995 l. 6, my *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* IV (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, 179. Bd. 6. Abh.) p. 59 f., M. Holleaux, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* VI p. 22. In l. 9 of Le Bas-Waddington no. 429 the word after ζηλοῦν, ΕΙΟ, was, as we see now, not εἰ[θισται] but <β>ίον[s].

The proper reading of the first lines of the new decree therefore seems to be:

μεγαλομ[ε]ρ[ε]ς καὶ εὐσεβῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως ?] 34
[κ]αὶ εὐεν[ε]ύκ[τ]ως· ὅπως οὖν καὶ [ἡ φυλή τοὺς] 32
[ἀ]γαθὸ <δ> τῶ[ν ἀ]ν[δρῶν] [κα]ῖ ἀ<ξ>ίου[s]
ἐπισημα- 32
5 [σ]ίας καὶ τιμ[ῆ]ς ἀπο[δ]εχομένη καὶ [τιμῶσα] 32
[φ]αίνητα <ι> ἕνεκεν τοῦ πολλοῦς [τὸν πρὸς δ-] 32
[ρε]τή[ρ]α] ζηλοῦν βίον· [ἀ]γαθὴ τύχη ἐπληρῆσθαι 33
Διονύσιον κτλ.

On the whole, the restoration proves the correctness of Mr. Laumonier's copy.

ADOLF WILHELM.

Vienna.

TWO NOTES ON CICERO, DE SENECTUTE.

XX 72. Recteque in ea vivitur quoad munus officii exsequi et tueri possis.

possit P, posset L, possis *rell.*

The editors are divided between *possit* and *possis*. The superior MSS. P and L disagree, and the following considerations seem to me to decide the issue definitely in favour of *possis*, which would be an example of the generalizing use of the second person singular of the subjunctive set forth in Madvig's *Latin Grammar*, §370, and in Munro's note on *Lucr.* II 41:

(a) This construction occurs frequently in *De Senectute*, viz.: with *si* or *nisi*, VII 21, IX 28, XI 36; with *cum*,

III 9; with a relative pronoun, IX 27 and 28, XIX 69; also independently, in a question, a command, and a prohibition, X 33.

(b) The indefinite second person ('one can') is natural after the generalization *vivitur* ('one lives'). This is supported by a remarkable parallel in *Juvenal* IX 118-120,

*Vivendum recte est cum propter plurima,
tunc his
praeipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum
contemnas.*¹

¹ *contemnas* is no less an example of the construction in question because the verb owes its mood in the first place to *ut*. The same situa-

(c) *Quoad possit* is completely at variance with Cicero's usage at least in his Speeches and in his Philosophical and Rhetorical Works, in which he uses the subjunctive with *quoad*, whether meaning 'so long as,' or 'so far as,' only (1) when the verb is oblique or virtually oblique, and (2) when the verb becomes subjunctive by attraction.¹ The cases are: (1) *De Domo* LIII 137; *Phil.* II 35 89; *Pro Flacco* XLI 103; *De Or.* III 44 174; *Pro Caecina* VII 20; *Fr. Or. A* XIII 1 1 (Mueller p. 272); *Timaecus* III 9. (2) *De Leg. Agr.* II 7 19; *Laelius* I 1; *De Off.* III 10 43; *De Inv.* I 17 24. Neither of these conditions is fulfilled in the present instance, and *quoad* has no claim to a subjunctive. But the essential characteristic of the generalizing use of the second person singular is that it produces a subjunctive where the construc-

tion arises when the generalization takes the form of a dependent question, e.g. 'nisi statuas quid facere debeas . . .'

¹Of the *Letters* I can only say that the cases quoted in Nizolius' *Lexicon Ciceronianum* offer no exception to this rule.

tion would not otherwise admit of one. We may compare *De Or.* III 53 203, 'vel ante vel postquam dixeris, vel cum aliquid a te ipso reicias,' where the conjunctions have a purely temporal meaning, and the subjunctives are due to the generalizing nature of the statements. For *quoad* so used, v. *Lucr.* II 850, 'quoad licet ac possis reperire.'

IX 27. Quod est eo decet uti et quidquid agas agere pro viribus.

agas MSS, agis Reid.

The editors of the C.R. have pointed out that arguments which I had submitted in defence of *agas* had been anticipated by Professor Housman, C.Q. 1919, 73 ff. *Floreat qui ante nos!* To his passages add *De Or.* II 62 252, 'quod, quibuscumque verbis dixeris, facietum tamen est'; *ibid.* III 45 176, 'quocumque ducas'; *Orator* XVI 52, 'quocumque torqueas'; also Varro, *De Re Rustica* I 40 6, 'in quamcumque partem inseras . . . ita inserere oportet.'

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

University of Sheffield.

NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT.

bidens, II. B. For '(swine, sheep, ox) . . . altiores habent' substitute 'a "two-tooth" sheep: Quae bidens est hostia, oportet habeat dentes octo, sed ex his duo ceteris altiores, per quos appareat ex minore aetate in maiorem transcendisse.' Delete 'It is more correct . . . are complete' and the reference to Hebrew. The sentence cited in L. and S. as from Hyginus is Gellius' summary of his opinion, not Hyginus' *uerba ipsa*. For the facts about a sheep's teeth see Henry's note cited by Conington on *Aen.* 4. 57. *Bidens* is what is called in Tasmania a 'two-tooth.' If Roman writers applied the word to other animals, as Gellius says, the only explanation is that which Johnson gave for his definition of *pastern*. When Mr. H. M. Tomlinson decorates the pre-war woman's bonnet with bangles and makes her drink out of a demijohn (*All our Yesterdays*, p. 30), the simple and certain explanation is that Mr. Tomlinson has confused the words 'bangles'

and 'bugles' and does not know what a demijohn is.

gugga. Plautus, *Poen.* 975-7. *MI.* sed quae illaec auis est quae huc cum tunicis aduenit? | numnam in balineis circumductust pallio? | *AG.* facies quidem edepol Punicast. *guggast* homo. *gugga* is not in Forcellini-De Vit, K. E. Georges (7th edition), or L. and S. I would suggest that it is a Latinized form of γύγης, a heron, and continues the joke of 'quae illaec auis est.' For γύγης see O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, II. 204, 'Lautnachahmend wie buteo . . . ist auch das hettisch-griechische gyges, nach ältester Aussprache guges, Rohrdommel.' Hence, according to Keller, Lake Gyges near Sardis and King Gyges got their names.

horia. L. and S. render 'a small vessel, a fishing-smack.' But in Plautus, *Rud.* 910, 1020, it is handled by one man and therefore is clearly a fishing-boat, the translation given by L. and S. for *horiola*. It is a delusion of L.

and S. that diminutives express smallness, and they render all diminutives accordingly, whereas it is notorious that they express affection, pity, or contempt, and not smallness. ὑποκορίσματα is a much better name. The quantity of *horia* and *horiola* in L. and S. is wrong. Rud. II. cc. prove that the first syllable is long.

laridum The meaning 'lard' is disproved by Horace, 2 *Sat.* 6. 64, pingui . . . lardo—the epithet would be absurd if *lardum* meant lard—and by Martial, 5. 78. 10 et pallens faba cum *rubente* lardo. *laridum* means bacon; cf. Fr. *lard*=bacon. Add references to *Historia Augusta*, *Hadrianus*, 10 § 2 *cibis* etiam *castransibus* . . . *utens*, hoc est *larido*, caseo et posca; and *ibid.*, *Avidius Cassius*, 5 § 3, praeter *laridum* ac *buccellatum* atque acetum militem in expeditione portare prohibuit; and Apicius, *de re coq.*, 7. 11, *laridi* coctura, which in itself is sufficient to show that *laridum* is not lard.

lolium. Delete 'cockle, tares.' *Lolium* is darnel; see the Oxford Dictionary, s.v. cockle.

melimelum. In *Cl. Q.*, xi. 139, I said that Hehn thought *melimela* were quinces made into jam. I had not then read his book and was misled by Friedländer's note on Martial, 1. 43. 4: 'Becker-Goell III. 81 u. a. verstehen süsse Aepfel, Hehn 199 (zu Marmelade eingekochte) Quitten. . . .' But what Hehn says, at least in his seventh edition, is: 'dass sie aber eine zum Einkochen in Most und später in Honig vorzüglich geeignete Varietät Quitten waren, bezeugt nicht nur der Schol. Cruq. ausdrücklich, sondern lehrt auch das spanische *membrillo*, das portugiesische *marmelo*, Quitte, Quittenmus, von welchem letzteren das allgemein europäische Wort Marmelade abgeleitet ist' (*Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, 7th ed., 246). He means that *mala mustea* were quinces suitable for cooking in *mustum*, and that, when it became the practice to cook them in honey, they were called *melimela*, and that the express statement of the *Comm. Cruq.* that Horace's *melimela* were quinces ('*melimela*: suauissima mala, κνδώνια μήλα') and the fact that the Spanish and Portuguese words for a quince are derivatives of *melimelum*

justify him in believing that Horace's *melimela* were quinces. But it is clear from Pliny, *N.H.*, 15 § 51, *mustea* a celeritate mitscendi, quae nunc *melimela* dicuntur a sapore melleo, that in his time *melimela* were a sweet early apple. Columella too, *de r. r.*, 5. 10 § 19, distinguishes *melimela* from *cydonia*. I still think that Martial, 13. 24, proves that *melimela* did not mean quinces till after Martial's time. Apicius, 4. 2 § 37, has a recipe 'Patina de Cydoniis: mala Cydonia . . . uel elixata ex melle' which shows that quinces were commonly boiled in honey and that they were still called *cydonia*.

mendicabulum. The rendering 'a beggar, mendicant' is wrong. Nouns in *-bulum* are verbal nouns expressing the instrument with which the action denoted by their verb is performed or the place of its performance, e.g., *uena-bulum*, an instrument for hunting, a hunting-spear, from *uenor*, *uena-bulum*, an instrument for carrying things, a vehicle, from *uecto*, *pa-bulum*, material for feeding animals, from *pa-sco*, *concilia-bulum*, a place of assembly (*concilio*), *latibulum*, a place for hiding (*lateo*), *stabulum*, a place for standing, a stall or shed (*sto*), (see Lindsay, *L. L.*, pp. 332, 334). Similarly *mendicabulum* means something that enables one to beg, e.g. the donkey that carries a begging priest's outfit, Apuleius, *Met.* 9. 4 die sequenti rursus diuinis exuiis onustus cum crotalis et cymbalis circumforaneum *mendicabulum* producitur ad uiam (cf. 8. 24 qui per plateas et oppida cymbalis et crotalis personantes deamque Syriam circumferentes mendicare compellunt). Here *mendicabulum* is not 'a vagrant beggar,' as Professor Mooney renders it in his note on Suetonius, *Vit.* 12, but a beggar's instrument, the animal he uses in his begging. Take again Apuleius, *Apologia*, 22, uerum tamen hoc Diogeni et Antistheni pera et baculum, quod regibus diadema, quod imperatoribus paludamentum, quod pontificibus galeum, quod lituus auguribus. Diogenes quidem Cynicus cum Alexandro magno de ueritate regni certabundus baculo uice sceptri gloriabatur. ipse denique Hercules inuictus—quoniam haec tibi ut quaedam *mendicabula* nimis sordent— . . . neque una pelli uestitior fuit neque

uno baculo comitator. Here *haec* are clearly not Diogenes and Antisthenes, but the wallet and stick that they carried, and *mendicabula* does not mean 'beggars,' as Professor Butler says, but 'the outfit of beggars'; the comparison is not between Diogenes and Antisthenes on the one hand and Hercules on the other, but between their outfit and his. Hence in Plautus, *Aul.* 703, *nam istos reges ceteros | memorare nolo, hominum mendicabula, hominum mendicabula* mean human beings who are the instruments used by beggars to help them in begging, *e.g.* the boy who guides a blind beggar. Thus the slave calls kings, not 'beggars,' but 'beggars' assistants,' *i.e.* they are worse than beggars. *hominum*

is the genitive of apposition; *i.e.* the *mendicabula* in this case are *homines*, *cf.* *flagitium hominis* (see Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, II. 68, where this passage is cited as an example of the 'appositional genitive').

Forcellini-De Vit, while taking *mendicabulum* to mean beggars in the above passages, say it seems that it can also be used for beggary or begging, citing Ausonius, *Perioch. Odys.* 18, *Irus adest populo per mendicabula notus*. But there too *mendicabula* may mean the outfit of a beggar, *i.e.* his rags, his stick, and his wallet.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

University of Tasmania.

XENOPHON, *HELLENICA* I. VI. 32.

Καλλικρατίδας δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ Σπάρτη οὐδὲν μὴ κάκιον οἰκείῃ αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος, φεύγειν δὲ αἰσχρὸν εἶναι.

οἰκείῃ, incorrect in grammar and weak in sense, has puzzled the editors. Liebholt, Breitenbach, and Riemann ring the changes on *οἰκείῃ*: others read *οἰκείῃ*: but these various corrections are open to the objection that, while improving the grammar, they yield no convincing sense. Simon suggests *οἰκτιρεύῃ*, a word which suits ill with the Spartan mentality, and certainly does not fit the vigorous commander who, but for a change of weather (I. vi. 28), might well have destroyed the Athenian fleet by a surprise attack launched at dawn, and won the glory which a year later fell to Lysander.

A more drastic correction is needed,—something with the raciness expected in the *mot* of a Spartan.

If *οἰκτιρεύῃ* be read, the true sense is recovered: 'Sparta will not have a worse man at the helm when I am gone.' Callicratidas is in charge of his country's fortunes: he is ready to risk them in battle against superior numbers: he knows the Spartan Higher Command is not bankrupt: his country is strong enough to do without him. Moreover he is the Admiral, answering his *οἰκιστῆς*.

ROBERT QUIRK.

Winchester College.

ARISTOTLE, *N.E.* I. VI. 1, 1096A 14.

Δόξει δ' ἂν ἴσως βέλτιον εἶναι καὶ δεῖν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ γε τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὰ οἰκεία ἀναρεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ φιλοσόφους ὄντας· ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντων φίλων ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

'Yet perhaps it would be thought to be better, indeed to be our duty, for the sake of maintaining the truth even to destroy what touches us closely, especially as we are philosophers or lovers of wisdom; for, while both are dear, piety requires us to honour truth above our friends.'—ROSS.

In this familiar text (the echo of which reached even Mr. Micawber), the translators and commentators all, if am I not mistaken, agree with Professor Ross in construing *ἀμφοῖν* as meaning *τῶν οἰκείων καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*. But the old Latin translations ran *Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica* (or *sed maior*) *ueritas*. Does this indicate that *ἀμφοῖν* was taken to mean 'both Socrates and Plato' and to refer back to *φίλους ἄνδρας* and forward to *οἱ δὲ κομισάντες τὴν δόξαν ταύτην*, which follows the sentence quoted above?

No doubt however the modern construe is the correct one, and the plurals are *plurales maiestatici*: Aristotle can hardly have fathered the Theory of Ideas on Socrates.

Perhaps it has not been generally noticed that *ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* reads like a verse quotation, which may account for the rather high-flying expression *ὅσιον*.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

A PAPYRUS CODEX AND AN EARLY EXAMPLE OF 'QUATERNIO.'

In his fascinating *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1932) Sir Frederic Kenyon has succeeded in rendering every previous treatment of the subject out-of-date. An interesting confirmation of his view of the period within which the papyrus *codex* was used is furnished by a reference in Cassiodorus *Inst.* 8 § 1: *reliquas (epistulas) in chartaceo codice conscriptas uobis emendandas relinqui*. This work is dated between A.D. 551 and 562 by Paul Lehmann.

Cassiodorus, but not Cassiodorus as printed, gives us in a somewhat earlier work an unknown example of the word *quaternio*, used with reference to a book. The passage occurs in the Pseudo-Primasius commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Migne, *P.L.* lxxviii 476D), which I successfully restored to Cassiodorus in 1906: *expositio . . . ob hoc in*

quaternione isto conscripta. So reads the sole manuscript known to me, namely Grenoble 270 (saec. xii ex., formerly of the Grande Chartreuse), but the first editor, Jean de Gaigny,

obliterates this interesting phrase by substituting *hic* for *in quaternione isto*, and all the other printed editions have the same reading.
University of Aberdeen. A. SOUTER.

REVIEWS

STATES, PEOPLES, MEN.

ERNST KORNE-MANN: *Staat, Völker, Männer, aus der Geschichte des Altertums*. (Das Erbe der Alten, 2te Reihe; Heft xxiv.) Pp. viii+158; 1 plate and 4 plans. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 6 (bound, 7).

THIS is a collection of six lectures, mostly delivered in the last two or three years, but beginning with Dr. Kornemann's inaugural address as Rector at Breslau in 1925: this propounds the large central problem of 'The Ancient State,' while the others treat sundry phases and stages of the same problem in more or less topical connections. The whole is furnished with a copious apparatus of notes and references to the literature of the several subjects, which are not the least valuable part of the book. It may, however, be remarked that of over 160 authors cited nearly 90 per cent. are German: one or two American monographs and articles are noted, but apart from Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History* the major contributions in English are almost entirely ignored.

Vom antiken Staat is a comprehensive and ambitious survey—somewhat in the manner of Spengler—in which Kornemann seems to discover a recurrent or rhythmical pattern in the history, marked by the symmetrical series of names: Darius i; Philip and Alexander; Caesar and Augustus; Diocletian and Constantine; Justinian; with a corresponding series of 'syntheses,' among which, for instance, Caesar's is interpreted as a 'Graeco-Roman βασιλεία with an oriental Einschlag'—much in the sense of Eduard Meyer's *Caesars Monarchie* (opposed by Adcock in *C.A.H.* ix, 17, a discussion which Kornemann might with profit have considered). The elements of the pattern are the town-dwelling Greeks, with their lack of a 'feeling for space,'

the essentially peasant Italian stock, and the Persian bureaucracy as created by Darius, the means for extending and developing the democratic and national *Volksstaat* into the autocratic and supranational *Völkerstaat*. The outline is firmly sketched and suggestive, but the treatment is rather unconvincingly dogmatic. It ends with a denunciation of President Wilson.

More important, because of narrower and more precise reference, are the papers on *Athen und Attika* and *Die unsichtbaren Grenzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*, in which the angle of approach is mainly geographical. The first is an application of Thucydides's method, to discover the successive stages of the synoecism by noting the relative positions within the expanding city of the shrines of local Attic divinities—Athena herself (from Pallene), Artemis Brauronia, the cults of the Sunium peninsula, the Anakes of Aphidna, the Apollo cults of the Marathon district, and finally the Demeter of Eleusis. The 'invisible frontiers'—not a wholly appropriate title—are the client states of the Republic and the Empire, whose history is being investigated by the Ancient History school at Breslau.

The lecture on Alexander the Great is an exercise in *Quellenforschung*, with the purpose of identifying more precisely the elements that go back to Ptolemy's book, which would give the genuine Macedonian view, unfalsified by Greek ideas, and thus of special value as an almost unique expression of the great people who made history but did not write it—especially of their military and political tradition. 'The Emperor Tiberius' is a somewhat slight and cursory narrative, written in opposition to the Tacitean view given by Dessau—and coming to much the same results as the English portraits

by Tarver and Baker. The last lecture is on *Die erste Befreiungstat des deutschen Volks*, namely the destruction of Varus—mainly a discussion of the site, which Kornemann would find, not in the hilly country of the Osning or the Wiehengebirge, but further south and west in the marshy lowlands of the middle

Lippe. It concludes with a lament over the German fate—the hero Arminius destroyed by the inveterate *politische Unfähigkeit* of his own people—and a rather tremulously enthusiastic declaration of faith in the genius of Adolf Hitler.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

RELATIONS BETWEEN YUGOSLAVIA AND MACEDONIA IN THE EARLY AND LATE BRONZE AGES.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Yougoslavie—Fascicule 1. Zagreb, Musée National. Fascicule 1. Vučedol. Par V. HOFFILLER. Pp. 37; 48 plates. Paris: Champion (London: Milford). Boards, 21s.

VERY little of the pottery of Vučedol has hitherto been published. It has, however, from time to time, attracted the attention of archaeologists, and certain elements, especially in its decoration, had suggested affinities with regions as remote as Cyprus and Mesopotamia. Before these affinities, which, it must be confessed, appear rather fanciful, can be accepted as indicating relationship, we must wait for the full analysis of the ornaments which M. Hoffiller has promised. In the meantime it is worth while to draw attention to affinities nearer to hand, which have not yet, as far as I know, been noticed. Connection with the N.-W. Anatolian corner of the Early Bronze Aegean civilization is to be inferred with certainty from the tubular lugs 'growing from the rim' (Pl. 41, 1, 2), whose original home is the Troad and Lesbos, whence they found their way to Macedonia with the first Bronze Age settlers, and have been traced as far as the Crna valley. They are also found in Boeotia (Eutresis) and the islands (Naxos). The upturned ends are characteristic of Macedonia, where ribbed examples also occur, to which the ribbed body-lugs from Vučedol (e.g. Pl. 44, 1-6) may be compared. These body-lugs are closely related to the tubular strap-handles which are as characteristic of Early Bronze Age jars in Macedonia and Greece as they are of Vučedol (e.g. Pls. 43, 45). As far as forms go, the Vučedol pottery has,

in fact, quite an Aegean look, and North Aegean at that (especially the large vases on Pl. 1; Pl. 2, 8; Pl. 3, 3, 4), and, when it is a question of the derivation of one civilization from another, forms are more significant than ornaments. Within a given cultural region ornaments and systems of ornament differ from village to village, but forms are often constant over the whole. In view of the expansiveness of the Early Bronze population of North Greece, it would not be at all surprising if Vučedol, like Lengyel,—during part of its history—proved to be an outpost of that Early Bronze civilization of Anatolian origin of which the Western limits are still imperfectly known.

For the ornaments too, analogies, apart from those with the pottery of neighbouring sites, can be found in the South-East, *viz.* in the Late Bronze Age in the Vardar valley, where incised fragments showing the typical Vučedol concentric circles, semicircles and arches, with fringed or cogged outer edges, appear rather suddenly about the same time as Mycenaean imports. To take only a few examples, Pl. 12, 8, Pl. 11, 11, Pl. 26, 1, 2, 9 have startling parallels at Vardaróftsa or Várdino (unfortunately, we have no shapes from these sites), and if the connection, first suggested by Hoernes, between the Vučedol incised and the Mycenaean painted 'medallion bowls' really exists, it might have been created by invaders in the Vardar valley, anticipating by about two hundred years the Lausitz invaders in the same region.

Enough has been said to show that the Vučedol pottery raises interesting

questions, even though they cannot at present be answered.

We are grateful to M. Hoffiller for presenting the first instalment of the material in such an admirable form,

and look forward to the next. Its high standard speaks well for the future fascicules from Yugoslavia.

W. A. HEURTLEY.

TWO HISTORIES OF GREEK LITERATURE.

A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian, by H. J. ROSE, M.A. Pp. viii + 454. London: Methuen, 1934. Cloth, 21s.

Griechische Literaturgeschichte, von JOHANNES GEFFCKEN. 2. Band. Von Demokritos bis Aristoteles. Pp. viii + 290 + 246. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934. Paper, M. 20 (bound, 23.50).

PROFESSOR ROSE has again earned the gratitude of all students of the Classics. This book, so far as the reviewer is aware, is unique in English. Quite properly it is entitled not a History but a Handbook, and it will be often and profitably handled by those who are wise enough to buy it. The book consists, like the same author's *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, of three elements: (1) the text proper; (2) paragraphs in smaller type for those who want fuller information; (3) notes, which are printed at the foot of the page, a better arrangement than in the *Mythology*, where they are at the end of each chapter. We will take these in the reverse order, since for the scholar that may well be the order of importance. For the learning and accuracy of Professor Rose's notes is well known. Not only does he give references to ancient and modern authors, but he often gives valuable summaries of discussions or debated points. The note on Stesichorus on p. 108 is a good example; not everyone has an opportunity of reading Vürtheim's book. In other notes he is more personal; he makes short work of such stories as that of Tyrtæus the lame Athenian school-master, and he has a happy knack of 'ticking off' the pedant, ancient or modern, who cannot see a joke. Next, the paragraphs in small print; here too Rose will be invaluable. The best authenticated facts about obscure poets, complete lists of the lost plays of the

dramatists with information about each—to have such matter in one well-indexed volume covering Greek literature from Homer to Lucian will be an inestimable boon. The narrative proper, which is 'complete in itself and assuming no previous acquaintance with Greek writings,' as is said on the dust-cover, deals primarily with the principal writers. Here, quite naturally, there will be more difference of opinion and the reader, especially the newcomer to Greek literature, may be disappointed. For, admitting that the great authors are the most difficult to deal with, and admitting freely that Rose's chapter on Homer is an admirable piece of work in a small compass, yet it will hardly give a reader who does not know Homer already much idea of Homer's greatness or encourage him to read the *Iliad* for himself. He is better in this respect on Hesiod than on Homer and good on the lyric poets and their new fragments. He makes excellent use of the Polycrates fragment of Ibycus (*Ox. Pap.* 1790) but barely even mentions the *Paeans* of Pindar (*Ox. Pap.* 841). The account of the Athenian stage and the production of plays (pp. 138-147) will be very useful, but more might have been made of Aeschylus' *Supplikes* as a means of showing the uninitiated the real nature of Greek drama. He is good on the *Ajax* of Sophocles but might have refrained from abusing the unfortunate novice for whom he is writing (p. 164). None of the great writers is so well treated as Euripides, on whom Professor Rose is helpful and illuminating in spite of some impatient remarks on the *deus ex machina*. Prose writers down to Aristotle are all treated together in a single chapter divided into three parts, Philosophy, Oratory, and History. It might be questioned whether the literary

importance of Aristotle justifies his generous allowance of ten pages of the chapter. Isocrates has only two. This is followed by chapters on Hellenistic Poetry and Prose. A useful final chapter brings us to A.D. 150. In an excellent bibliography it is surprising not to find the name Croiset when space can be found for several works on grammar and metric. Professor Rose is so meticulous about the spelling of names—e.g. he writes Sekyon—that one is surprised to find always Mitylene, *Μιτυλήνη*. Is there any inscriptional authority for this? Is it not simply an error, though an ancient one?

The first volume of Professor Geffcken's *Greek Literature* appeared in 1926 (see *C.R.* XLI, 1927, pp. 230-231) and the second has been eagerly awaited. We are assured that we shall not have to wait so long for the third, which will deal with the orators, historians and poets of the fourth century. The second volume begins with Democritus, discusses Socrates and the Socratics, and then devotes itself entirely to Plato and Aristotle. This seems to break up the proportions of the whole work, which looked like being a well-balanced book; now more space is given to Plato alone (II 35-188) than to the entire field of drama, tragic and comic (I 141-263). However, as the author says (p. 163), 'One who has found in Plato a constant companion through life has a right to testify to all that the educator of the Hellenes and of mankind . . . has meant to him,' and the trio Socrates, Plato and Aristotle mean so much to him that we gladly welcome the book which he has written on them. He does not lose sight, or not for long, of the fact that he is writing a history of literature, not of philosophy; but it is just in this respect that the loss of nearly all the Socratic literature except Plato, Xenophon and Aeschines makes the task so difficult. Nor can the historian of literature neglect entirely the person of Socrates himself, though he was not a writer, since his life and work led to such important literary activity. But the personality of Socrates is to-day little more ascertainable than the personality of Agamemnon, since like him he passed

quickly from history into legend and from legend into literature. But to say that the Socrates of the *Apology* is a creation of fancy or legend does not mean that it is necessarily untrue; it must indeed have considerable truth. Plato's Socrates was at least evoked by recollections of a real person, and, if Socrates was a martyr, he must have been a martyr to something. Even Xenophon cannot be entirely neglected; we must not, out of sheer scepticism, 'let the baby run out with the bath water,' as Professor Geffcken says. But the task of disentangling the historical from the literary Socrates is as baffling as ever, as is also the question, which Geffcken deals with, of his contribution to philosophy. It would be unfair to attempt to summarize here the answers put forward, but no Platonic student should neglect them any more than the long chapter on Plato, which is a book in itself. There are some excellent observations, which indeed might have been amplified a little, on the dialogue as a literary form. The account of the dialogues themselves is good. He does not discuss in detail the chronological order or indulge in any new *Spracharithmetik*, as he calls it, but groups the dialogues, as far as may be, according to their apparent relation to each other, being guided at the same time by the more certain of the results of stylometry. The *Ion* and *Hippias Minor* are put early and the first book of the *Republic* is put before 388, being a preliminary sketch for the later work. What is more interesting is Geffcken's analyses of the dialogues. His immense bibliographical knowledge has not weighed down his vigorous pen and keen critical faculty or lessened his appreciation of Plato's dramatic power or of the relish with which he pricks Sophistic bubbles. Not that Plato is not in earnest, far from it, for, as Geffcken rightly says, Sophists who were 'mere virtuosos showing off their art' were the enemies of all objective thought. He is particularly good on the *Protagoras* and the *Gorgias* and has a long note on the relations of the latter dialogue to the *κατηγορία Σωκράτους* of Polycrates. The concluding section of the chapter on Plato deals with his *Nachwirkungen*, his

successors and the spurious dialogues, in which are included *Hippias Maior*, *Alcibiades I*, and the *Epinomis*. The volume of notes, in this volume bound, but not numbered, with the text, surveys the literature of every question raised, and will be invaluable to Platonist and

Aristotelian alike, for Aristotle is as fully treated as Plato. There is an excursus on Platonic studies and their history, not so comprehensive as the similar excursus on Homeric studies in volume I, but no less useful.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

Belfast.

HESIOD'S THEOGONY.

FRIEDRICH SCHWENN: *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos*. Pp. v+148. Heidelberg: Winter, 1934. Paper, M. 5.

THE game of dissecting Hesiod is no longer a favourite; still, on the one hand the somewhat loose structure of his poems undoubtedly offered temptations to an interpolator, while on the other his style is sufficiently individual to make the detection of later additions reasonably possible to a careful reader. Schwenn tries to steer a middle course between suspecting everything and accepting everything, with the result that his suggested excisions call for consideration, though not all of them have convinced the reviewer.

He holds that the bulk of the *Theogony* is genuine Hesiod (incidentally, he does not dispute the poet's identity with the author of the *Works and Days*), but that at no very late date it passed through the hands of several tolerable poets, albeit inferior to Hesiod himself, who made additions large and small, the most noteworthy being the episode of Typhoeus, 820-880, and the preceding section, 720 sqq., dealing with Tartaros. The latter he suspects to be the work of three different writers, none of them identical with the poet of Typhoeus. The arguments are of the usual type, based upon somewhat minute points of style, language and arrangement, and would require considerable space to examine in detail. In general it must be admitted that they are plausible, if nothing more, and show very good knowledge and appreciation of Hesiod.

Many smaller excisions, attributed to the 'bearbeiter' who wrote the passage concerning Typhoeus, are less likely to be right and sometimes show imperfect appreciation of the environment of the

poet, a rhapsode of great ability and an original turn of thought living amid a comparatively primitive peasant population. Thus, Schwenn would excise the swallowing of Metis, 888-899. To the reviewer, this is one of the most characteristically Hesiodic things in the whole poem. A crude myth of swallowing, comparable to that concerning Kronos and his offspring (which Schwenn does not suspect), has been turned into an allegory; the all-wise god has Good Counsel within him, 'in his maw' as Chaucer's seaman might have said. Other criticisms rest on very doubtful construals of the text, as in 292 (p. 62), where he seems to suppose that the timeless aorist *διαβάς* ('on the occasion, at the moment, of his crossing') implies that Herakles met and killed Geryoneus some time after reiving the cattle and at some distance from Erytheie; 127 (p. 111), where he leaves the possibility open that the subject of *καλύπτοι* is Gaia; or on misunderstanding of the peculiarities of style, as on p. 127, where he deduces from 459 that Zeus is already both born and swallowed, not noticing that the *τοὺς μὲν* of that verse, referring to the elder children of Kronos, is answered by the *ἀλλ' ὅτε* of 468, referring to Zeus. His remarks on religious and mythical points, notably the excursus on Aphrodite, pp. 117-126, are always ingenious, though a certain lack of anthropological training vitiates a few of them. As regards Aphrodite, he would derive not only her story in Hesiod but the myth of Uranos from Oriental legends, instancing the mutilation of the bisexual Agdistis, as told in some late authors. The argument has chronological difficulties to face, for all the authorities who mention Agdistis

are very much later than Hesiod and it is by no means easy to determine how much of their story is either genuinely Oriental or genuinely old. Nevertheless, the reminder that the Near East is a likely source of inspiration for a poet of (probably) the eighth century B.C. is quite in place.

A minor weakness, not affecting many parts of the monograph, is the parading of a few old and familiar turnip-ghosts such as 'der $\Xi\omicron$ O-Dichter', the 'author of the $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\tau\eta$ ', and one or two more whose proper place is in a museum of learned delusions. H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE LANGUAGE OF EURIPIDES' LYRICS.

WILHELM BREITENBACH: *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft). Pp. xix + 294. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934. Paper, M. 21.

THIS painstaking and valuable work is divided into five main sections, dealing with vocabulary, 'tropes' (metaphor, personification, metonymy, periphrasis, brachylogy, etc.), figures (anadiplosis, anaphora, assonance, etc.), word-order, and echoes of earlier poets. The method employed is severely statistical. But in the field of language clear-cut lines of division are seldom to be found, and the classification at times seems capricious. Thus the list of words 'taken from Epic' includes such $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\alpha$ $\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ as $\alpha\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\chi$, $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\xi\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\theta\rho\eta\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\kappa\iota\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$. Contrariwise $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, reckoned as prose-words, surely had a poetical sound to an Attic ear. (Dr. Breitenbach generally ignores dialectal distinctions.) Such anomalies make one a little sceptical of the statistics. But the reader can always turn from the figures to the lists, and draw his own conclusions from them.

Euripides does not come unscathed through the ordeal. It turns out, as one would rather expect, that in word-coining and in idiom (anadiplosis is an obvious case in point) he is at times mechanical, monotonous, lacking in freshness and creative power. 'Dull, but lucid' is often Breitenbach's ver-

dict: and sometimes not even lucid. Ardent Euripideans need not start up in anger: the poet's greatness lies in other fields.

Some detailed criticisms suggest themselves. A tendency to avoid external symmetry is not, as Breitenbach suggests, peculiar to 'high lyric diction.' It is palpably present in Thucydides, and not absent from Demosthenes and other prose authors, the desire for formal balance conflicting with the desire for variety. The *figura etymologica* is styled a 'bei Dichtern allgemein beliebte Figur': it is also extremely common in certain prose-writers. 'Paregmenon' (the juxtaposition of varied inflections of the same stem) is as common in, say, Plato as in the 'Gorgianic school.' The frequency in Euripides of verbs compounded with prepositions is interestingly brought out. This might have been put into connection with the craze for such compounds in late-fifth-century sophistic, which contemporary comedy parodied. In *I.A.* 1495 'verweilen' is surely impossible for $\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon$ (in spite of Wecklein): and in *El.* 469 'mit den Blicken abgewandt von Hektor' for $\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\mu\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\ \tau\rho\omicron\pi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$.

But, when all has been said, this is a book which will without doubt be of considerable use to any serious student of Euripides' style. It is to be hoped that the author will supplement it by a study of the poet's dialogue idiom.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

MAGNUM DE PARTICULIS OPUS.

The Greek Particles. By J. D. DENNISTON. Pp. lxxxii + 600. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 25s.

THE avid Grecian, eagerly falling on this book, which promises him a philological vitamin of which he has hitherto been seriously starved, sustains one or two unpleasant shocks. First, he reads (p. x) that 'the Table of Contents will, I hope, enable the reader to find what he wants quickly.' It will not: *experto crede, Lector*, or if not, take a stopwatch and see how long it takes you to find, say, γέ τοι δὴ, μὲν οὖν δὴ, νῦν, μὲν, μὲν δὴ οὖν, first in 'Denniston' and then in 'Klotz on Devarius.' The Table of Contents gives an excellent summary of the text, but it is surely a delusion of Gallic thrift that a Table des Matières can ever take the place of an index. After this, he will not be surprised at the lack of an Index Locorum, and reflexion will show that an index of 30,000 references or more would have made the book very bulky. But he will say to himself, and *hoffentlich* to the publishers also, that he would readily buy a Vol. II containing an Index Particularum and an Index Locorum. But a worse shock ensues, when he remarks with dismay that this book, though not destined for the general non-reader, but exclusively for scholars, and obviously to be used by them largely as a work of reference, has been brought out with untrimmed edges, for all as if it were an edition of Casanova's *Memoirs* issued by the Panpranko Press for the Milesian Society of Book-Fanciers.

But the text's the thing; and here happily there is a very different story to tell. Except for the Aristotelian Corpus, where he has mainly relied on Bonitz's Index (p. vii), Mr D. has evidently searched personally with candles practically all Greek literature down to c. 320 B.C., and his Veitch-like industry goes hand in hand with penetration and judgement. On the basis of a vast array of examples usage is carefully determined and differences of meaning and force subtly discriminated and often aptly brought out by

English renderings. Everyone will have much to learn from these *cartae doctae et laboriosae*. Among many other points of interest I would specially mention these: the fact (*attendite, quaeso, ludi magistri*) that ἄρα μὴ DOES NOT EXPECT A NEGATIVE ANSWER (p. 47); the impossibility of pressing the difference between εἰ καὶ and καὶ εἰ (p. 301); the suggestion that οὐκοῦν is always interrogative in Plato (p. 433); the use of οὖν to emphasize a prospective μὲν (p. 473). Much of great value is quoted from the private collections and notes of Mr R. W. Chapman.

Alteration or addition appears to me desirable in several passages. P. 7 f. (ἀλλά 'simply expressing opposition' in continuous speech). More illustration from prose is wanted, and it would be well to state that, though common in Plato and the Orators, the use is rare in *unspoken* Greek (e.g. Th. i 11, 2; i 132, 5; v 64, 4; vi 31, 3). P. 46 f. (ἄρα = ἄρ' οὖν). Note Pl. *Prm.* 149e ἄρ' οὐκ = ἄρ' οὐκ οὐκ. P. 170. Hdt. iv 154 Ταῦτα δὲ Θηραῖοι λέγουσι is cited as an ex. of 'δέ for οὖν or δὴ.' Is it not perhaps a case of 'duplicated δέ'? In any case it should be brought into connexion with Th. i 44, 87 (*ubi v. Steup*), ii 90, iii 68, vi 88 [*all init.*], not quoted by Mr D. anywhere. P. 190, 192, cf. lxxi. Exceptions to the statement that in Attic Prose connective οὐδέ (μηδέ) is only found after a negative clause are Th. i 10, 4, vii 77, 2 and (?) i 42, 3. P. 191. Mr D. calls the use of οὐδέ (μηδέ) as a balancing adversative without preceding negative clause 'a rare use,' citing only four Homeric exx. (+ a fifth in the *Addenda*) and one from Theognis. Rather, the use is fairly common in Homer, very rare thereafter. I have noted at least 35 exx. in the *Odyssey*, while to Mr D.'s single post-Homeric case should be added [*Hes.*] Sc. 368, 418, Simon. 121 (99), 3, A. Ag. 263, S. O.C. 481 and the passages in Hdt. and Plato where editors keep or write οὐ δέ, μὴ δέ, which Mr D. quotes as something quite different on p. 187 (add Hdt. ii 70, 177, vii 149, viii 60). P. 219. In E. Hp. 347

τί τοῦθ' ὃ δὴ λέγουσιν ἀνθρώπους ἐρᾶν; 'δὴ expresses Hippolytus' remoteness.' That is, at the least, obscure. Surely δὴ reinforces the suggestion of λέγουσιν that ἔρως is known only by hearsay to Phaedra. (As Mr D. has allowed himself (p. ix) to repunctuate his editors' texts, he might have done so here: the comma he prints before ἐρᾶν expels syntax and sense from a simple enough line, to which Pl. R. 338e, rightly understood, supplies an almost exact parallel.) P. 379. (<Apodotic> δέ corresponsive with μὲν in the subord. clause). 'I have . . . perhaps admitted out-of-the-way usages too readily here and there' (p. lxxxii). The self-criticism seems justified here. While the idiom is certain in Homer, Mr D.'s later exx. are very weak. Of Th. i 67, 2 he himself says 'but perhaps put a comma after κρύφα δὲ (sc. πρεσβευόμενοι), with Steup.' Since Krüger proposed this before 1826 few editors have seen any 'perhaps' about it. In Pl. Lg. 780b Mr D.'s three dots between ἐγένετο and γενοσάμενους represent 26 words, so that anacoluthon can be naturally assumed, as it is also most natural to do in *Cri.* 44b (see Burnet *in l.*). In these circumstances England's explanation of Lg. 898c, alluded to by Mr D., seems to be best. [If the use was established for post-Homeric Greek, *Epin.* 976a might be regarded as an instance.] P. 421 (περ οὖν). In saying that in E. *Hr.* 1307 'ὥσπερ ὦν δίκαιος could only mean "tamquam si iustus esset"' Mr D. makes the common assumption that a comma must be put after δίκαιος, but see Méridier *in l.* P. 422. 'οὖν is also used with indefinite relatives, especially with ellipse of verb in the relative clause . . .' Apart from Is. fr. 22 ['ὡς ἂν οὖν δυνάμεθα (οὖν del. Bekker)'], D. xxx 20 (καθ' ὅποσονοῦν δέοιτ') is the only ex. of non-elliptical οὖν among those cited by Mr D. It is also the only one I have noted in classical Greek, and I cannot help feeling that the -οὖν is due to quasi-dittography. Observe how Lysias (xii 84), rather than say ἀπολιπεῖν ἡντιοῦν τις βούλοιο, is at pains to write ἡντιοῦν ἀπολιπεῖν ἡντινά τις βούλοιο. P. 458 (γούν), p. 459 (ἡγουν). Here and elsewhere Mr D. quotes 'the post-

classical pseudo-Aristotelian *de Plantis.* 'Warum nicht Mistriotis? Had he been aware that the *de Pl.* is post-classical by 1600 or 1700 years, his mild doubts (p. lxx) of the genuineness of ἡγουν in Hippocrates must have been intensified. (The earliest exx. appear to belong to v/A.D.—Procl. *in Euc.* p. 122, 1 Fr.; Pap. Flor. 384, 29). P. 480 (μὲν οὖν). Is it quite fair to say that Campbell's rendering of πάνν μὲν οὖν μνημονικῶς by 'most certainly with praiseworthy recollection' ignores μὲν οὖν? C. probably supposed that μὲν οὖν merely added emphasis to πάνν and intended his 'most' to represent it (cf. Des Places). I agree with Mr D. in thinking μὲν οὖν intrusive, but I should imagine dittography had something to do with it (MENOTNMNHMON). P. 487. 'ἡπερ comparative: Epic and Ionic prose only.' Very likely, but reference should be made to Th. vi, 40, 1 and Aeschines Socr. p. 58 fin. Kr. (cf. the sub-classical—for Mr D. p. 567 merely 'doubtful'—Pl. *Alc.* ii 149a). P. 489. To his two Platonic exx. of 'ἀλλ' εἴπερ, by itself, following a negative statement' add *Eud.* 296b (cf. E. S. Thompson, *The Meno of Plato* p. 262, a book Mr D. never mentions).

One or two things give me the impression that Mr D. has not the familiarity with MSS that breeds due suspicion of the great editorial silences. His complete separation of passages such as Pl. *Plt.* 284d τοῦτον τε γὰρ ὄντος . . . , μὴ δὲ [μὴδὲ B] ὄντος . . . (p. 187) from others like Hom. *a* 369 δαινύμενοι τερπόμεθα μὴδὲ βοητὺς ἔστω (p. 191) suggests that he is unaware that, while it is commonly impossible to say from mere inspection whether scribes mean οὐδέ or οὐ δέ, they normally show by the accentuation that they mean μὴ δέ, even when the meaning is 'not even.' Again, he seems to imply that the MSS write οὐκουν in Pl. *Smph.* 175a (p. 432) and οὐκ οὖν in Th. ii 43, 1 (p. 424), while what he says on pp. 424, 439, indicates that he greatly underrates the frequency of οὐκ οὖν in MSS. To take one more example, he asserts (pp. 449, 460) that the MSS 'show no trace of δοῦν.' To be sure, his conclusion in regard to οὐκοῦν etc. that 'the manuscript tradition . . .

cannot be made the basis of investigation (or only with great reserve)' (p. 440) is sound enough, but one could wish that the discussion showed more exact knowledge of the particular facts. At times, too, he ignores important variants (e.g. p. 62 *μαλακός* Pl. *Smf.* 173d).

But these and other minor criticisms which I think can be made do not at all affect my conviction that this is not merely an unusually good and important book, but a really great work of scholarship.

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

A COMMENTARY ON THE POETICS.

ALFRED GUDEMAN: *Aristoteles ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ*. Mit Einleitung, Text und Adnotatio critica, exegetischem Kommentar, kritischem Anhang und Indices. Pp. viii + 496. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1934. Cloth, RM. 16.

THE compiler of a bibliography of Aristotle's *Poetics* might hesitate before he added to the labour of an eventual successor by producing a commentary as well. An original interpretation for the consideration of experts or a clearer and more concise statement of the present arguments on the old cruxes for the benefit of students might be his justification. Which of these aims, or whether both, Professor Gudeman proposed to himself is hard to say, as he seems hardly to succeed in either. More than forty years of work have not brought him to the promised land. The milk of human kindness is turned to an acerbity against some who possibly at times deserve it, and even against those who never do, like Bywater or Rostagni. Every commentator has been ransacked for his honey, which, however, often will not cohere for lack of structural principles.

It is a disappointing book. Its industry and erudition are undoubted. There is genuine enthusiasm, though it may exceed his understanding, for Aristotle as a 'Geistesheld.' But in the five hundred pages of this diffuse volume disappointment begins early. That the predicative position of the adjective in τὸ ποίημα τραγικόν as a heading in the table of contents is no accident is shown by the frequent citation later of Aristotle as the author of a *πραγματεία τῆς τέχνης ποιητικῆς* (pp. 1, 2, 21, 144, 160). The discussion of the first three words of the *Poetics* is not reassuring, as

ποιητικὴ is said to be identical with ποίησις in meaning, which is to say, as τέχνη is understood, that the principles and rules of poetry, e.g. the *Poetics* itself, are a poem. The translation 'about the art of poetry itself' is dismissed as giving 'no tolerable sense.' Such dogmatic statements without their reasons, which are often far from obvious or, if obvious, disputable, are frequent with Professor Gudeman.

The introduction discusses three points: (1) that the *Poetics* for stylistic reasons must be a 'Kollegienheft,' Aristotle's own notes for lectures to the élite of the Lyceum; (2) its arrangement; (3) that Aristotle's work is based on a mass of critical literature over and above Plato, of whom Aristotle is independent.

On the first point, the stylistic argument is acute so far as it goes, but is made to hinge on c. 15, 54b18, which according to Gudeman implies that the *Poetics* could never have been published by Aristotle, and is not referred to in the *Politics* and *Rhetoric*. Aulus Gellius N.A. XX. 5 is quoted in support, though he seems rather to suggest the opposite.

The second point is that Aristotle's division of the subject matter into two, namely the τέχνη and then the τεχνίτης, is based on a sophistic division familiar in 'isagogic' writings, e.g. in Horace. Under τέχνη falls also ποίημα. The first half is cc. 1-12, in which the word ποιητής occurs seldom, and in the second, cc. 13-24, it occurs frequently, as also does δέι (30 times). On this theory the plot, c. 13, falls under the heading 'poet' though it is the most important 'part' of a 'poem'; as also do cc. 19-22 on grammar. The division seems irrelevant, and alien to Aristotle's

treatment of the poet and his poem in a concrete process, and so no improvement on the orthodox analysis.

With regard to the third section, of Quellenforschung, Aristotle's vast knowledge of literature and criticism is common ground. But Gudeman, in opposition to Finsler's perhaps excessive emphasis on Platonic influence, by the same method goes to the opposite extreme of exaggerating Aristotle's debt to other predecessors than Plato, and of refusing to see any reference even polemical to Plato in c. 26 or in c. 3 on *μήμεις*, or in the theory of *κάθαρσις* any thought of Plato *Phaedo* 69a-b. In any case this hunting for sources does not amount to much, since the *Poetics* is our chief source of information, and what use Aristotle there makes of such material is much more important than conjectures about the context of this or that citation. Gudeman admits however that in essentials the *Poetics* is a tacit protest against the Platonic condemnation of tragedy. But Aristotle's originality would have been better defended by explaining the *Poetics* in the light of his main philosophical concepts. Because Aristotle's philosophy and Plato's differ, a profound influence is not therefore 'psychologically excluded,' and that difference should not be baldly asserted to be, in regard to poetry, that Aristotle made pure 'aesthetic' pleasure its sole aim and purpose. But Gudeman in spite of the example of Jaeger and Rostagni does not study the historical growth and context of Aristotle's theories, nor does he anywhere use Aristotle's own works to explain in the *Poetics* such important terms as *αἰτία*, *ἦθος*, *ἡδονή*, *προαίρεσις*, etc. He has not seen the wood because of the branches of a tree.

For example let us take *κάθαρσις*, the most important crux of all. That an explanation of it can have occurred in the second book, Gudeman denies because the definition in the Tract. Coislinianus is false and because a *κάθαρσις διὰ γελίου* is 'unaristotelian.' Yet Gudeman admits the possibility of a *κάθαρσις ὀργῆς* and rightly notes the significance of *τὴν κάθαρσιν*, i.e. a special kind. One wonders what the second book, on the existence of which

he so strongly insists, did contain according to Gudeman.

Nor is Gudeman convincing in his arguments against Bernays' theory. According to Gudeman the *κάθαρσις* of *ἐνθουσιασμός* in the *Politics* is not 'identisch' nor 'wesensgleich' but at best only 'in analogical relation' to the poetical *κάθαρσις*. But as Gudeman does not explain what the poetical *κάθαρσις* is, he is simply asserting this. Nor will it do to dismiss the words of Iamblichus and Proclus as vague neoplatonic speculations and as having nothing to do with Aristotle, precisely where Proclus and Iamblichus defend poetry against Plato, and where Proclus mentions Aristotle in this connection. The reason alleged for this by Gudeman is that Iamblichus and Proclus 'in one breath' speak of both Tragedy and Comedy. But this is a reason only because Gudeman has rejected the possibility of a *κάθαρσις διὰ γελίου*. The 'fact' that Aristotle puts forward a purely hedonistic view of poetry shows that Iamblichus' and Proclus' moral defence of poetry cannot be derived from him, and according to Gudeman anyone who hears an echo in them of Aristotle is guilty of a 'circulus vitiosus.' If so, Gudeman's own thesis begs the question until we know that Aristotle's theory of *κάθαρσις* is not theirs. He proceeds only to state some 'assured points.' The first is that *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* are in themselves harmful. But Aristotle believed that there was a right degree of fear for certain things, felt by the *φρόνιμος*. Gudeman adds that after the removal of the morbid stuff a psychic equilibrium is established. But an equilibrium of what? The quotation from *Lear* V. iii. 'the judgement of the heavens which makes us tremble, touches us not with pity' has nothing to do with Aristotle's observation that *οἱ ἐκπεπληγμένοι οὐκ ἐλεοῦσιν*. To say that the effect of tragedy depends on the nearness in time of the events to the spectator is to transfer from the *Rhetoric* to the *Poetics* without the caution advised two or three pages before by Gudeman himself, and it is the virtue of a *μήμεις* that it *presents* *πράττοντας*, *ἐναργῶς* *πρὸ ὀμμάτων*. There is not here space to argue that

Gudeman has misunderstood the relation of pity to fear as expounded in the *Rhetoric*. The removal of the emotions is a Platonic and Stoic ideal, not an Aristotelian, nor can Milton rightly be cited as holding this purgation-removal view, since he adds 'to temper and reduce them to just measure by a kind of delight.'

But Professor Gudeman is not always happier in less important questions, for instance 51b21 οἶον ἐν τῷ Ἀγάθωνος—? He says that the title Ἀνθος, flower, should long ago have disappeared from our texts, quoting Wilamowitz that ἄνθος for Ἀνθεύς is mere slavish following of the Byzantine accent, and urging the Arabic as deciding 'without doubt' (ὅς ἂν θῇ) for Ἀνθη. Ἀνθεύς, Ἀνθης, Ἀνθη, Ἀνθος are all possible names. But Parthenius in his Ἐρωτικά Παθήματα, p. 26. no. XIV περὶ Ἀνθέως, adds ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστοτέλης. It is true that Antoninus Liberalis in the *Μεταμορφώσεις συναγωγῇ*, p. 77. no. VII (Teub. My-

thogr. gr.) tells the story also of an Ἀνθος.

What Gudeman's view of περιπέτεια is, cannot be made out clearly, as passages are quoted but not discussed, nor can one find any comprehension, much less solution, of the difficulties of ἀηθείς in 50a25.

Such defects are not counterbalanced by correctness on many minor points. The method of the book is at fault because it does not show the *Poetics* as part of Aristotle's philosophy or its place in its development, and where it mentions such general concepts of Aristotle's philosophy it seems gravely to misconceive them, e.g. Aristotle's 'pure aestheticism.' It is also often obscure and dogmatic, and too much concerned with the overgrowth of comment to reach to the root of Aristotle.

On pp. 13-14 'induction' should surely be 'deduction' and vice versa.

C. G. HARDIE.

British School at Rome.

AN ITALIAN TEXT OF LUCILIUS.

N. TERZAGHI: *C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae*: in usum maxime academici digessit brevissimaque adnotatione critica instruxit N.T. Pp. viii + 93. Florence: le Monnier, 1934. Paper, L. 15.

If the memory of Lucilius is not green in Italy, it is not for want of watering. Mr. Terzaghi's edition follows hard on Mr. Bolesani's, and he promises a commentary for next year. Without that commentary it is difficult to form an adequate judgement on his text; for, as most of the remnants are scraps without a context, it may be impossible to guess what, if anything, an editor conceives them to mean until he tells us. Mr. Terzaghi's own contributions to the text are small—no discredit to him, for much of it is beyond healing; the most interesting of them is at 611 (I use Marx's numeration), where his *et veri*, though *et* is not wanted, is neat and makes some sense and is therefore an improvement on Marx. He suggests a few combinations of fragments, not always convincingly: 1347, as Mr.

Housman once suggested, could be fitted to several places, but 540 is not one of them. He is willing to abandon Marx and shows some discrimination in taking account of other scholars. But some good emendations are entirely ignored (as a rule he only states the source of those which he accepts), e.g. Dousa's *haec* at 111, Baehrens's palmary *Pacideianum* at 354, Bergk's *virique* at 1119. In his commentary Mr. Terzaghi may perhaps explain his reasons for rejecting these, but it is a pity that they should be passed over in silence here. In the desperate passage 1138 *sqq.* he prints Marx's nonsense-verses and quotes by way of explanation Marx's paraphrase (the fact that others have seen objections is very unobtrusively stated); and he accepts some of Marx's most curious supplements without remark—e.g. <*horto*> in 311, which, in what he with Marx supposes to be a list of presents for a wealthy widow, sandwiches 'pied gardens' between poultices and junket and makes *satura* with a vengeance.

There are a few inaccuracies; at 54 an emendation of Turnebus in Varro is printed without ascription, and at 530 *et* (apparently *et*) is substituted without remark for *atque* of Nonius.

Some exegetical matter appears in the notes, most of it quotation from Marx or from Nonius. A good deal seems to be occupying space which might have been better employed, and glosses on such everyday things as *muscipula* and *insperato* and *saperdae* might well have been omitted. On 48 Marx's note seems to have misled Mr. Terzaghi into thinking that the praetorship had to come before the aedileship, and on 182 he makes nonsense by getting Havet's explanation the wrong way round. Schema can be neuter and can be abla-

tive, but it cannot be ablative neuter, as he takes it in 804, and in his own vernacular *scossa* represents *excussa* and not (as he suggests on 103) *succussa*. There are several misprints—*amblemate* (85), *praetium* (40), *sciri* for *scire* (1347), *Fauni* for *Fanni* (1211), *bonorum* for *malorum* (1334), *sābacum* (733 note).

We hope that in his commentary Mr. Terzaghi will tell us why *symmiraciodes* should mean *puerile* in 187, what authority there is for *grus tota* meaning 'a flock of cranes' (168), why *scūta* should have a diminutive *scūtella*, how he justifies *lēae* in 301, and how he knows that, in the three-word fragment *et velli mappas, velli* is perfect.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

A NEW TEXT OF LUCRETIUS.

T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura libri sex: recensuit J. MARTIN. Pp. xii + 300. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 7.40.

THIS text embodies, with much learning, and on the whole with sound judgment, the considerable advances in our knowledge and understanding of Lucretius that have been made since Brieger's edition appeared. In particular, the work of English and American scholars is not ignored, though the 1922 edition of the Oxford text seems to have escaped the editor's notice. The preface on the MSS is adequate; the supreme value of Oblongus and Quadratus as our authorities is not denied, but they are not to have the last word always. The *apparatus* accordingly gives many readings of other MSS, as well as a good supply of old and recent conjectures. But it is not unduly copious; and even with the intervening *testimonia*, room is found for an average of about 28 lines of well-printed text on each page. Fortunately no attempt has been made to follow Giussani in wholesale re-arrange-

ments of the text, which in this and in other respects is on the whole conservative. The editor has admitted some 40 conjectural readings of his own into the actual text. As these are not separately collected, it is perhaps worth while to give the references here. All are worth some consideration. Perhaps the most noteworthy are ii 428, 466; iii 240, 962; iv 491, 544; v 429; vi 541, 858. Next to these: i 555; iii 594; v 568; vi 550, 972. Less convincing: ii 43, 209, 422, 547, 926; iv 545, 822; v 1094, 1442; vi 762, 1012, 1247. The weakest seem to be ii 252, 462, 928; iii 58; iv 81, 632, 1168; v 1339; vi 490, 520, 555. The scanty fragments are printed at the end of the book; and there is an *index nominum*. For the ordinary student there is no reason why this book should take the place of Mr. Bailey's Oxford text; but for the special study of Lucretius it will be indispensable.

L. H. G. GREENWOOD.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

CATILINE.

G. P. AMATO: *La Rivolta di Catilina*. Pp. 148. Messina: Principato, 1934. Paper, L. 10.50.

THE 'bad press' from which Catiline has suffered through the ages has provoked a natural reaction among modern scholars. In 1878 E. S. Beesly represented Catiline as the political heir of the Gracchi; in the present volume Dr. Amato magnifies him into a statesman who stood for economic justice and political equality throughout the Roman dominions and would, under a kindlier star, have anticipated the best reforms of the Caesars.

In support of this attractive thesis Dr. Amato sets forth a somewhat discursive argument which is not easy to summarize. He sweeps aside most of the incriminating evidence in Cicero and Sallust as mere propaganda; he makes the most of some stray remarks in which Catiline declared himself the champion of the oppressed; and he represents Catiline's programme of debt-remission as an efficacious remedy for distress among the Roman proletariat.

It is now generally agreed that the testimony of Cicero and Sallust needs careful sifting. But the patient and searching scrutiny of John, von Stern, and Hardy (whose standard works on the subject Dr. Amato does not appear

to know) has shown that in its main outlines it is inherently credible and consistent. Dr. Amato's more perfunctory re-examination of the ancient evidence hardly suffices to overthrow the conclusions of his predecessors.

The only substantial argument for regarding Catiline as a genuine social reformer is his projected bankruptcy law. This would no doubt have brought relief to some of the Italian peasantry. But it is extremely doubtful whether the proletariat at Rome had any debts to be remitted; and the silence of Cicero almost compels us to assume that Catiline's 'novae tabulae' were not intended to benefit the hard-pressed debtors in the provinces. In all probability Catiline's debt-law, like other such measures of the later Republic, was not a weapon of 'democracy' against 'oligarchy,' but of the impoverished senatorial aristocracy against the equestrian plutocracy. Dr. Amato does not sufficiently take into account the antagonism between the senatorial and the equestrian order.

Catiline was hardly worse than Milo, Caelius or Dolabella. But Dr. Amato's chivalrous attempt to represent him as a misunderstood hero overshoots the mark.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE PRIAPEA AND OVID.

RICHMOND FREDERICK THOMASON, PH.D.: *The Priapea and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poems*. Pp. viii + 100. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1931. Paper.

THE collection of the 81 licentious but clever *Priapea* which both Donatus and Servius included among Virgil's minor works has long been a subject of dispute as regards authorship. One of the fundamental contentions here is that they are not due to several different authors, but that a single author is implied by ii. 9 *sqq.*, where *notavi* is taken to mean 'scratched,' 'wrote.'

The aim of the dissertation is to suggest that this single author was Ovid.

Dr. Thomason, a pupil of Professor Radford, who believes that both the Tibullan Appendix and the Virgilian Appendix are Ovidian, explains that he is indebted to him for the plan of this study. In an interesting introductory sketch of the history of the collection, he makes the points that a quotation called Ovidian (*Ovidianum illud*) in the elder Seneca comes from the *Priapea*; that eminent scholars have seen in certain of the poems either the spirit or the actual hand of Ovid; and that Poliziano indeed attributed to Ovid the

whole of them. In the detailed analysis of the language which follows, all the elegiac lines, 196, are examined along with 41 hendecasyllabic and 57 iambic lines, making together 294 out of the 473 in the *Priapea*. Lists are drawn up of Ovidian coinages shared by the *Priapea*, words occurring in Ovid and the *Priapea* only, and rare words in one other poet of the Golden Age besides Ovid and the *Priapea*. It may be noted that when on p. 11 the verses of 'all the poets of the Golden Age except Ovid' are summed up as 35,029, Manilius and Grattius (to whose hunting-poem Ovid specifically alludes) are overlooked. Similarities to Ovid in phrase are also recorded; and a summary of findings concludes that 'the language of the *Priapea* is thoroughly Ovidian as regards the use of individual words and forms.'

It should be pointed out that it is too sweeping to say (p. 8) that 'modern criticism has shown that all the "Vergilian" opuscula are spurious'; that it is difficult to make out the '11 words first introduced by Ovid' (p. 13); that, as Professor Radford has indicated in *A.J.P.*, 1932, p. 391, *Phidias*, being a Propertian word, should not be among the 11; and that, even if the coinages

were 11, they cannot make 25 words, as stated on p. 13, when added to the 13 words from Ovid and the *Priapea* only. This is largely a numerical inquiry, and accurate arithmetic seems essential.

An instructive chapter on the metre of the poems is contributed by Professor Radford, in which, as a not unnatural protest against the idea that Ovid's art was perfect from the outset, he distinguishes periods in the development of his versification and places the *Priapea* among the poems of a period before that in which Ovid attained his supreme artistic skill (7 B.C.-8 A.D.). Examining such features as the endings of the pentameter, the percentage of dactyls, the chief *schemata* of the hexameter, and the types of caesura, he concludes that the elegiac *Priapea*, though a work of great metrical refinement, yet does not contain all the artifices belonging to Ovid's central artistic period. His claim, however, that its 'technique completely refutes the hasty and baseless speculations of Lachmann, Haupt, L. Müller, Birt and Skutsch' must obviously depend on an acceptance of the *Priapea* as Ovidian.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE LOEB VITRUVIUS.

Vitruvius on Architecture. Edited and translated into English by FRANK GRANGER, D.Lit., A.R.I.B.A. In two volumes. II (Books vi-x). Pp. xlviii+384; 12 plates. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE merits and defects of this volume are in the main those of its predecessor (see *C.R.* xlvii 29 ff. and Dr Granger's reply, *ib.* 58 ff.). The introduction, though sometimes far-fetched and whimsical, is lively and original, and the translation is readable and vigorous. Many of the technical difficulties of these most difficult books are ably and courageously tackled, though several of the descriptions remain desperately obscure. Excessive reverence for the manuscript tradition, which for Granger still means simply H, remains the car-

dinal defect, needlessly accentuating the hardness of the student's task. The strangest instances are his acceptance of *ex ciuitatis* (where *sex* is a panacea) in vii *praef.* 5 and of *ex librati uentris* in viii. 6. 8 as 'Greek genitives'. Among others the retention of *tempore* in viii. 2. 2, of *retardatione* in ix. 1. 6, and of *speculatum* in x. 16. 11 may be mentioned as especially unfortunate, but the text is full of manuscript readings so clumsy or unnatural as to be virtually indefensible. In vi. 2. 2 G's *scenis* is much more probable than H's *cenis* (*caenis*), and H has the same blunder in vii *praef.* 11, though Granger's note does not there reveal the fact. The many corruptions which Granger is forced to admit in such mathematical chapters as ix. 7 might well have given him pause in other passages.

His defence (pp. xliii ff.) of his view of G's 'interpolations' ignores the fact that in a remarkably high proportion of these cases omission by lipography in H is the obvious explanation, for instance (in this volume) in vii *praef.* 14, vii. 1. 7, vii. 5. 3, viii. 1. 2, ix *praef.* 15, ix. 1. 7, ix. 2. 2, x. 1. 2. His own emendations are largely alternatives, often plausible, to similar suggestions already in the field: among the best are *appelluntur* in ix. 4. 2, *quando* in x. 1. 6, and several corrections of numerals in the baffling chapter x. 11. None is so striking as that attractive correction of the passage about the Samian Heraeum in vii *praef.* 12 which he first put forward in *C.R.* 1924, 112.

An unfortunate change is made in vi. 7. 2, where misunderstanding of *familiaricae* has led him to intrude slaves' privies (*sellae* for *cellae*), such as Varro consigns to manure-heaps, into the colonnades of the *gynaeconiis*: other unconvincing novelties are *area* in vi. 8. 9 and *protecturas* in vii. 5. 2.

In vi. 1. 7, Granger prints (after his reading of H) *quod altiores habent distantias mundi*. Whether we read this or *ad mundum* the context shows that the meaning must be 'because of the greater distance between them and the *mundus*,' but Granger translates 'because they occupy the higher distances of the world,' perhaps because he shrinks from admitting to himself the full absurdity of the theory expounded by Vitruvius. In viii. 3. 13 *non tantum* seems to mean 'not only' rather than 'not to such an extent.'

The two oddest instances of Granger's perverse ingenuity are in vii *praef.* 15 and in ix. 8. 1. In the first passage he retains 'two hundred years' as the interval preceding Antiochus's activity

at the Athenian Olympieum, and justifies this by a note 'Calculated from Alexander's accession, B.C. 336-164.' He gets this out of 'post mortem autem eius (sc. Pisistrati) propter interpellationem reipublicae incepta reliquerunt. Itaque circiter annis ducentis post Antiochus rex . . .,' supposing that Vitruvius meant the reader to understand that the Athenian *respublica* expired in 336 and that the second *post* refers to that unmentioned date. In ix. 8. 1 Granger retains the manuscript reading *panthium* as the name of the type of sundial which follows the *arachne* in his list, though we read a few lines later of the *conarachnen* (*conarchenen* in H), immediately followed by the *conicum plinthium* (*conatum plinthium* in H). From this by a series of hazardous steps, most fully explained in *J.R.I.B.A.* 26 November 1932, he concludes that the Pantheon is a huge sundial, designed to show the summer solstice by the passing of the sun's rays through the centre of the imaginary sphere of which the dome forms the upper half. Unfortunately this phenomenon would occur only if Rome lay in the latitude of Syracuse, and we are asked to believe that Agrippa, 'a man of great scientific gifts,' failed to notice this fact when he erected, in imitation of a building at Syracuse, a wooden dome (for which there is no evidence), and that this wooden dome was faithfully reproduced, error and all, first in wood by Domitian and then in concrete by Hadrian.

The twelve plates which close the volume are useful, but aim only at general illustration and ignore much of the difficult detail. There are two good indices. D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

SENECA'S DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE.

WOLF-HARTMUT FRIEDRICH: *Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik*. Pp. vi + 156. Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1933. Paper.

THE unity of Seneca's tragedies existed in the poet's mind, but to realize it the percipient must make a contribution from his own imagination. With this

judgment Dr. Friedrich ends the conclusions (conveniently summarized on pp. 134 ff.) which he draws from a re-examination of some incoherences in six of the plays. Seneca sacrificed explicit unity for several reasons: sometimes he regarded, and composed, single incidents as self-dependent, inaccurately

relating them to the dramatic whole, or, in his attention to the general quality of a drama, neglected chronological sequence and dramatic development from scene to scene; sometimes he compressed together, to heighten the effect, inconsistent derivations from different sources; and often, by his habit of rehandling scenes, he left duplicated passages, of which neither is quite inorganic, yet both together are unsatisfactory. This general view is excellent, and up-to-date in its elastic conception of textual matters (cf. W. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, pp. 102 ff.). The observations of detail on which the arguments depend are sharp-sighted and show an accurate feeling for Seneca's style. But individually they are not all convincing, especially when the incoherences are slight [e.g. *Med.* 397 ff., 444 ff., 891 ff. (pp. 6 ff.; but cf. pp. 23, 134), *Oed.* 243 (p. 64; surely only a question-mark is wanted), 288 (p. 79; *in tempore ipso* is hardly worse than σύγχρονος), 388 (p. 71; *scire* [sc. nos] is not quite intolerable), *Troad.* 488 f. (p. 116), 963 ff. (pp. 110 ff.; *stent*, surely)]. Of course, Greek plays have notable incoherences also, for example Soph. *O.T.* Seneca's plays (especially *Oed.*) naturally have more, on account of his different means of communication, less dependent on development. They are more 'spatial': as Dr. Fried-

rich almost says, when he remarks (p. 132) of episodes in *Phoen.*, and of the prologue to *Herc. fur.* (necessary to give the right quality to Seneca's new Hercules), that their place is rather beside than before what follows. His technical method can be enlightened further by a comparison with Signor E. Cesareo's recent book, and Mr. T. S. Eliot's essay, on Seneca's tragedies. Concerning lost sources, Dr. Friedrich has some productive discussions [e.g. on conventions in later Greek tragedy (pp. 1 f.); on the use of the lost Eur. Ἰππόλυτος καλυπτόμενος for *Phaedr.* (pp. 38 ff.); and on the ghost of Achilles in *Troad.*, with an important interpretation of περὶ ὕφους 15. 7 (pp. 103 ff.)]. Perhaps he is inclined to overlook lost sources when extant sources exist [e.g. I think Norden's *Catab. Herc.* should be suggested for *Herc. fur.*—a deficiency partly supplied in an *Addendum* (p. 152)]. Much progress is made in deciding the attribution of lines to characters; there is a good example of a conservative and perhaps final solution of a problem at *Phaedr.* 404 ff. (pp. 24 ff.). The book has two indexes and is very well printed [but dittography has displaced *noctis decus* at *Phaedr.* 410 (p. 27), and *Oed.* 390 should be *Oed.* 399 (p. 73)].

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

STYLE AND DICTION OF THE ANNALS OF TACITUS.

NILS ERIKSSON: *Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus*. Pp. x + 137. Lund: Gleerup, 1934. Paper.

DR. ERIKSSON's purpose is to fill some gaps in our knowledge of Tacitus' style and diction. Since Wölfflin laid the foundations, the most important additions to the subject have been made by Löfstedt; and now one of his pupils has carried matters a good deal further. By a minute study of the use of substantives, cases, verbs, pronouns, adverbs, prepositions, particles and conjunctions as used in the *Annals*, he has demonstrated that Wölfflin was wrong in concluding that T. departs further

and further from the normal idiom as the work progresses. On the contrary, experiments and oddities are more numerous in I-VI than in the later books, and XIII-XVI show in many details a swing back to the constructions approved by Cicero. To take one simple example—*apud* with a place-name instead of the locative does not appear after VI. The evidence is, of course, cumulative, and of varying value: also there are some facts to support Wölfflin. But on the whole it cannot be doubted that Dr. Eriksson proves his case.

He thinks, though he prefers to sus-

pend judgement, that the language supports Bretschneider's¹ belief that the *Annals* were published in separate *corpora*. It is inaccurate to say, as Dr. Ericksson twice says, that Bretschneider believes in a series of triads—that was Wölfflin's opinion, whereas Bretschneider holds that XIII to XVI form part of a single *corpus*. However, Bretschneider did mark a break at the end of III, VI and XII. With regard to XII his conclusion, drawn from the treatment by Tacitus of his material, is confirmed both by Löfstedt and by Ericksson. A break at that end of III is not proved to exist by linguistic considerations.

The discussion of the various grammatical phenomena is exhaustive, and the conclusion generally carries conviction. In the examination of that tire-

some little equation *et = sed* I miss a reference to VI, 8, 2.

A chapter is devoted to the text of certain passages which have attracted much attention from the critics. Almost invariably the writer defends the reading of the MS. against conjectures—rightly, I think, in most cases. I rejoice to see that he rejects the addition of *cum* or *in* at II, 31 (*adpositum mensa lumen*). I have been protesting against the addition for many years, and citing, as Dr. Ericksson does, IV, 5 (*propositam toro effigiem* in the accepted text), where editors who demand *cum mensa* expressly point out that *toro* is ablative. He offers only one conjecture of his own—*quippe inopi* for *quin inopi* in XII. 20. This is an improvement on *cui* for *quin*.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Ericksson will continue his investigations.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

¹ Quo ordine ediderit Tacitus singulas Annalium partes. Strassburg, 1905.

PTOLEMY AND PORPHYRY ON MUSIC.

Ptolemaios und Porphyrios über die Musik.

VON INGEMAR DÜRING. Pp. 293.

(Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XL, 1934: 1) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1934. Paper, Kr. 10.

DR. DÜRING'S excellent editions of Ptolemy's *Ἀρμονικά* and Porphyry's *Τρόπωνημα* were reviewed in C.R. xlv, 242 and xlvii, 70; the present book is an important supplement to them. It makes little appeal to the average student of Greek or to professional musicians, but to the specialist interested in ancient acoustics and the theory of scales it will be indispensable. The work consists of: Introduction (pp. 3-12), which contains brief but shrewd comments on nineteenth-century studies of Greek music, on the problem of the Greek musical notations, and on the relation of Pachymeres to Ptolemy; a select Bibliography (pp. 13-17), which might well have been fuller under the headings of Instruments and Interval-measurement; a translation into German of the *Ἀρμονικά* (pp. 21-136); Erläuterungen (pp. 139-284); and useful Indices.

Ptolemy presents a difficult task to a translator because his technical terms are so often remote from our modern conceptions and his style is crabbed and tortuous; but Düring gives a clear and even elegant rendering which, in itself, is a skilful commentary on his author. In the (very few) places where I should hesitate to accept Düring's version the points at issue concern exegesis and not grammar.

In his notes he has adopted the plan of expounding Ptolemy's doctrine chapter by chapter and interspersing translations and explanations of Porphyry's *Τρόπωνημα* at appropriate places. But piecemeal treatment of important topics, the danger inherent in such a method, has been avoided by skilful use of cross-references and concentrated discussion at cardinal points. Some of the notes extend, in consequence, to several pages and are small monographs; especially valuable are the accounts of Ptolemy's philosophical background, of the theorist Archestratus, of the fragments of Heraclides Ponticus, of the theory of the *genera* (where Mr.

Winnington-Ingram's work is favourably discussed), of the *ὀνομασία κατὰ θέσιν*, and of modulations. Most readers would have been grateful if Dr. Düring had similarly given a survey of the relation of Ptolemy to his predecessors in musical theory, an analysis of the relation between Ptolemy's doctrine and music of his own and earlier times, and a clearer picture of the opinions Düring

holds about *αἰολοί* and string instruments.

In details Düring shows great wealth of learning, skill in argument, and sound judgment. This, his third book in five years, is an outstanding contribution to the study of the subject and fully worthy of his reputation.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

University of Liverpool.

CLAUDIAN.

- (1) PIERRE FARGUES: *Claudian: Etudes sur sa Poésie et son Temps*. Pp. 344.
- (2) *Claudian: Invectives contre Eutrope*. Texte latin avec un commentaire critique et explicatif et une introduction. Pp. xxxvi+101. Paris: Hachette, 1933. Paper.
- (3) R. MARTIN POPE: *Claudian: The Rape of Proserpine in English Verse*. Pp. xiv+97; frontispiece. London: Dent, 1934. Cloth, 2s.

THE case of Claudian might well have supplied Andrew Lang with the matter for one of his Historical Mysteries. Making a sudden appearance at Rome early in 395 he pronounces a panegyric on Probinus and Olybrius, the two young Anicii who are consuls for the year: soon he is promoted to be the official poet of the government and rapidly produces a series of important poems which remain as almost our only source for the history of the period: in January of 404, on the occasion of Honorius' sixth consulship, he celebrates the complete liberation (as he imagines) of Italy from Alaric: and then this strange star, after nine years of meteoric radiance, has burnt itself out and vanishes. Who was he? *Unde genus?* What was his education? How did he come to Rome? How do we explain his excellent command of Latin? Who was Hadrianus, the patron and fellow-countryman whom to his cost he lampooned? How did he rise to be the apologist of Stilicho, the German *magister utriusque militiae*? Why after the most magnificent and fulsome of his panegyrics does he suddenly disappear (by marriage or by death) as completely as his own Proserpine? There is little material to argue

upon; but M. Fargues, with the genius of his race for detail and for logic, analyses and sorts all the available evidence and all previous theories: and then, with the reasoned exactitude of a scholar and critic, proceeds to reconstruct a life of the poet, to estimate his value as an authority for the historian, and to discuss the literary technique and constituent material of his poems.

In this admirable study I can see Claudian as a poet of three aspects—as the clever versifier in the short occasional pieces; as an epic poet of some inspiration, feeling and melodiousness in the unfinished *Raptus Proserpinae*; and in the political panegyrics as the retained publicist whose tones of rhetorical eulogy towards his masters surpass the exaggerated flattery of Bacon to James I, whose words of obloquy and satire towards his official enemies might recall the savage animosity of the *Anti-Jacobin* or the *Epistle to Peter Pindar*. It is surprising how a man of apparently Egyptian origin should write Latin of such idiomatic excellence. Did he acquire it, as did the Humanists, by the study and imitation of classical models? Certainly the hard clear resonance of his lines and the polished finish of his style suggest the best writing of the Silver Age. And as to the picture of Honorius and Stilicho—M. Fargues' temperate view adjusts the perspective. Honorius is scarcely the etiolated weakling of common belief nor yet the perfect prince of Claudian's description: Stilicho, the regent, is not utterly unscrupulous nor again entirely disinterested. Some corrective is essential, for Claudian's

panegyric of Stilicho exceeds the measure: the godlike figure who guides young Honorius and saves the West has no human semitones: he is the superman, good, wise, strong, Nordic: and he appears all the brighter by contrast with his opponents, Rufinus and Eutropius. Claudian's historical portraiture resembles that of some modern films: the hero-worship is so grossly overdone as to be a caricature: for mere relief one welcomes such a hostile witness as Rutilius Namatianus. Of course, Claudian is professedly an apologist: 'il ressemble souvent à un journaliste inspiré par un gouvernement,' says M. Fargues in a penetrating criticism; 'il paraît avoir suivi parfois un mot d'ordre qui lui était donné.' Indeed he has little initiative: he requires a brief: he can embellish a cause. If ever by the grace of Persephone he should revisit the world, it will be as a professional biographer, a political editor, or chief of propaganda to some modern Stilicho.

It is pleasant evidence of the revival of interest in Claudian to note the

publication of M. Fargues' other volume, an edition of *In Eutropium* with apparatus criticus, notes, and a valuable introduction. I cannot say that, in my judgment, the notes contain much that is new: but the editor is thoroughly acquainted with the editions of Barth, Heinsius, Gesner, Burman and Koenig, and embodies in his commentary many of their best interpretations and suggestions. At the same time one welcomes the appearance, in the Temple Classics, of Mr. Martin Pope's verse translation of the *Raptus Proserpinae* and of two minor poems, *De Salvatore* and *De Sene Veronensi*. While Cowley's version of the Old Man of Verona still remains unsurpassed, yet in the main work of the volume—the blank-verse rendering of the *Raptus*—Mr. Pope has produced a readable and worthy translation which, in spite of a certain poetical freedom, strikes me as more just and natural than the prose translations in either the Nisard or the Loeb edition.

W. H. SEMPLÉ.

University of Reading.

JEROME'S LETTERS.

Select Letters of St. Jerome, with an English translation by F. A. WRIGHT, M.A., Professor of Classics in London University. Pp. xvi+510. (Loeb Classical Library). London: Heinemann (New York: Putnams), 1933. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

JEROME'S Letters are so interesting, both because of their admirable style, and for their graphic picture of social life, that they were bound to find a place in the Loeb Library. The present volume contains 18 of the 154 that have survived, but most of these are very long, so that we have a good deal more matter here than the proportion of the two numbers would suggest. There is also an introduction, a translation, a few notes and references, a genealogical table, two appendixes ('On Jerome's Correspondence with Roman Women' and 'Jerome and Origenism'), and an index of proper names.

To say that 'Augustine comes nearest to Jerome' in extent, but that he 'falls

short of his immense productiveness' (p. xii) is not correct. Again, on p. xiii Augustine's letters are ignored, though these are much more numerous than Jerome's, and though an admirable selection of them has already appeared in the Loeb Library. Canon Fremantle's list of Jerome's works (pp. xi f.) is now defective, as the new works edited by Morin do not appear in it. Among the chief MSS mentioned on p. xv the Autun and Balliol MSS deserved a place. It is strange to find Zöckler's 'Hieronymus, sein Leben (read Leben) und Werke (read Wirken)' mentioned on p. xv, and the later and more important works of Grützmacher and Cavallera ignored.

Hilberg's excellent Vienna text is reprinted in this edition, and 'the few divergencies from his text are noted where they occur' (p. xv). This last statement is not exact, as will be shown immediately. Hilberg's record of manuscript variants is, as a matter of fact,

even more important than his text, and an opportunity to improve his text from this source has been lost. I have made no systematic attempt to compare Hilberg with the Loeb, but the following errors are serious: p. 30, l. 11 *onus* omitted after *loricae*; p. 42, l. 25 *sponsum* should be *sponsam*; p. 44, l. 8 correct *subiecto* to *subiecta*, and l. 24 *primam* to *primum*; p. 64, l. 10 *posito vase* is not Hilberg's reading; p. 68, l. 11 *conscium* should be *consciam*; p. 76 (so p. 190) *Bersabee* (Beersheba) is a very common scribal confusion with *Betsabee* (Bathsheba) and should have been corrected; p. 80 *ebriati* should be *ebrietati*; p. 96, l. 1 for *configunt* read *confinunt*; p. 120, ll. 8, 9 Hilberg differs without mention; p. 126 read *praesidentis* for *praesidentibus* and *paenitentiae* for *patientiae*; p. 140, l. 21 read *orationi* for *oratione*; p. 164, l. 10 read *quod* for *quos* and later *Cavilentur* for *Cavilentur*; p. 172, l. 3 read *somnum* for *somnium* and l. 26 *ut* for *et*; p. 180 read *triennio* for *triennio*; p. 192 read *dereliquis* for *deliqueris*; p. 210, l. 5 read *quibusdam* for *quisbusdam*, and l. 9 *taceat* for *tacet*; p. 214 Hilberg is right, the walls are substituted for the pillars; p. 218, l. 8 read *fialas* for *filias*; p. 238, l. 23 for *cuius* read *cui*; p. 240, l. 4 for *qui* read *quo*; p. 248, l. 5 for *puto* read *puta*, and l. 28 for *Exuperius* read *Exsuperium*; p. 250, l. 23 for *et* read *ex*; p. 252 Hilberg is right; p. 254, l. 1 for *fidicianas* read *fidicinas*; p. 258, l. 7 for *is* read *si*; p. 260, l. 5 for *sorditatem* read *sordidatam*; p. 262, l. 2 for *Israhelitico* read *Israhelitico*; p. 266, l. 13 for *lacrimis* read *lacrimas*; p. 268, l. 5 the three words *dimisit hereditatem suam* are wanting, though they are translated; p. 304, l. 18 for *Iosaphat* read *Iosaphat*; p. 316, l. 5 for *Satanas* read *Satanan*; p. 334 for *grave onore* read *gravi onere*; p. 342, l. 3 for *excussit* read *exussit*; p. 348 Hilberg right in both places where he is rejected; p. 350, l. 7 read *cerussa* for *cerusa*; p. 386, l. 5 read *spirantia* for *spiritantia*; p. 390 *diligis* is Hilberg's reading, not *diliges*; p. 412 read *liberalibus* for *liberabilibus*; p. 416, l. 3 read *rennuendo* for *renuendo*; p. 418, l. 9 read *hunc* for *hanc*; p. 434, l. 1 read *detractatoribus* for *detractoribus*, and below *detractationibus* for *detractationibus*; p. 436 read *Saraptensis* for

Sareptensis; p. 470, l. 1 read *Israhelitico* for *Israheletico*, and l. 2 *nausiam* for *nauseam*; p. 476, l. 20 read *puellarem* for *puellarum*; p. 478, l. 12 read *corrunt* for *coruunt*. To save space, I refrain from specifying many places where the spelling in the text is not Jerome's or defects of punctuation or printing occur.

Jerome admits that he interweaves biblical language with his own. The editor gives only some of the references, not nearly as many as Hilberg, and some that Hilberg had omitted were recorded by Hilberg's reviewers and should have been given here. The character of some of the references indicated shows that the editor has rather hazy notions of the history of the Bible in Greek and Latin. For example, (p. 54: cf. p. 74) how could Jerome 'alter the text of the Vulgate' at a time when that text did not exist? The *figura etymologica* at the top of p. 66 is ignored. On p. 92 the Lucretian parallel might have been given; p. 146, n. 5, add the number of the verse of Isaiah viii; p. 198, the Cyprianic reference is lacking; p. 254, n. 1 is, I think, mistaken, as the reference is merely to rescuing virgins from earthly marriage; p. 290, n. 1 read 'confuses' for 'confesses'; p. 340 *fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani* comes from Tert. *Apol.* 18, and on p. 342 *vexilla militum crucis insignia sunt* is borrowed from Tert. *Apol.* 16; p. 348, last l., the Virgilian parallel should have been given; p. 430, n. 2, Bücheler writes *Testamentum Porcelli* with MS authority, not *Porci Testamentum*; p. 478 '*vivimus quasi—victuri saeculo*' is from Tert. *Apol.* 39 (of the Megarians).

The translation, though somewhat paraphrastic at times, is in the main correct, and reads quite well. But it is vitiated by the failure to render words or phrases in the original on the one hand, and by the rendering of words or phrases that do not occur in the original on the other. It is a fatal mistake to employ the Authorized Version to render biblical quotations in a Latin Father like Jerome, as if the text itself did not matter. In Jerome above all it does matter. Sometimes, too, the translation contains real errors. Occasionally W. is translating a different text

from that which he prints, as if the use of Hilberg were an afterthought. Let me illustrate these points, without attempting to indicate anything like all the places where I disagree with the translator. Page 45 'vigilant' is not in the original; p. 55 'plain' for *regione* and 'consumed' for *comprehendaris* (caught, seized); p. 59 'yonder' for 'this'; p. 67 'and then you will not have a crop of tares' is not in the Latin; p. 73 'dainty condiments' should be 'foods cooked in oil'; p. 77 *sancto* translated as if *sanctum*; p. 79 'Ammon' for 'Amnon' and 'notabilities' for 'how many'; p. 81 *et monacham* untranslated; p. 91 *nuptiae* translated as *nuptae*; p. 97 'women' for 'wives'; p. 109 'a spring' for 'a garden'; p. 113 'the eye of the Lord' for 'the city of God'; p. 125 'long nights' for 'many nights'; p. 131 *neque metunt* not rendered; p. 135 'then shall the Lord be my God' not in the original; p. 137 *castellis* should be 'villages', not 'fortified places'; p. 145 'or three' is a translation of an earlier text than Hilberg's; 'fist of wickedness' for *pugnis humilem*; p. 147, l. 4 *omnibus* is rendered as if it were *homini-bus*; p. 149 *volante* unrendered; p. 151 *deridetur* is printed, *delentur* is rendered; and below, *diversa* is printed, while *adversa* is translated; p. 153 *cibaria* unrendered, and so with *periculis fluminum*; p. 155 the late use of *saltem* is not understood, and on the same page 'the righteous Judge', 'at that day', and 'with our wine' are all absent from the original; p. 157 *columba mea* unrendered, and 'ride upon' should be 'mount'; p. 163 etc. *monilia* is more general in late Latin writers (such as Apuleius) than 'necklaces'; p. 165 'ground' for 'bare ground'; p. 175 'upon' for 'by being dashed upon'; *cibarius panis* is just 'common bread'; pp. 179, 389 *semper* untranslated; p. 183 'households' for 'household'; *manducantem* means just 'eating' in late Latin, not 'munching', and *levavere* is 'raised', not 'took'; p. 195 *coepisset* rendered 'was beginning' instead of 'had

begun'; pp. 249, 359 'verses' should be 'lines', to prevent misunderstanding; p. 251 *subinde* not rendered; p. 257 'who will appear for me in court?' is probably wrong, in view of parallel passages; p. 273 not 'minor works', but simply 'works' (as often in late Latin); p. 281 'money-belt' rather than 'sword-belt', as the reference to money is clear; p. 287 'daily meditation' is given as a rendering of *meditatione diuturna*, and *pectus*, as often, should be rendered 'mind' here; p. 289 *obsequiis* is rendered 'death-bed legacies' instead of 'flattering attentions'; p. 305 *tantia* unrendered, as also *ab his vincitur*; p. 309 'Pope' would better be 'Bishop' (so p. 449), in spite of the explanatory note; p. 315 'weak' should be omitted; p. 317 *vigorem* is read, but Engelbrecht's *rigorem* is translated, and *basilica quondam Laterani* should have been so translated as to show that it was a church then (St. John Lateran?); p. 321 read 'chest' rather than 'limbs'; p. 365 for 'arrangement' read 'punctuation'; p. 401 *vectorem* untranslated; p. 403 *non* before *faciendum est* overlooked; p. 425 for 'household' read 'property'; p. 449 *absque filiis ac nepotibus* is not 'cutting out her sons and grandsons' but 'being without sons and grandsons'; p. 459 *maxime* unrendered; p. 463 a whole sentence of seven words left untranslated; p. 467 *ridentem* untranslated, as on p. 469 *auferre linteamina*; p. 473 *cisternas dissipatas* is not 'cisterns of vice' but 'broken cisterns', as the scriptural allusion makes clear; also *levissime* is read, but *lenissime* is translated; p. 475 *arbitris* is 'witnesses', not 'companions.'

In Appendix I Walter Copland Perry's novel *Sancta Paula* (London, 1902) might have been mentioned, and on p. 494, n. 2, the late and more accessible edition of the Bordeaux Pilgrim by P. Geyer in *Itinera Hierosolymitana* (Vienna, 1898) should have been recorded.

It is abundantly clear that this book suffers from want of competence and of care.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

SECULAR LATIN POETRY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

F. J. E. RABY: *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*. Vol. I, pp. xii + 408; Vol. II, pp. viii + 388. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 35s.

THESE handsome volumes make worthy companions to the author's important *History of Christian Latin Poetry* noticed C.R. XLII (1928), pp. 88-89. From the fifth century to the twelfth (and there are glances at the thirteenth in an epilogue) is a long chronicle, which Mr. Raby presents with learning and skill. As he is intimately concerned with the survival of the rhetorical tradition of the ancient world, he very properly lays the foundations of his work in a preliminary survey of the inheritance of the Middle Ages and of poetry in the rhetorical tradition from the fourth to the end of the fifth century. Chapter III treats of The Sixth Century in Italy, Gaul, Spain and Africa: IV, The Age of Transition, includes, with the Latin countries, a story of Irish, British and Anglo-Saxon culture, and so paves the way for V, The Carolingian Revival—a valuable chapter. VI, The Tenth Century, deals with the school of St. Gall, the epics of Italian poets, and the 'Cambridge Songs.' To the eleventh century three chapters are devoted, namely on French, Italian and German writers of Latin poetry. The second volume is reserved for the achievements of the twelfth century, X French poets, XI English, XII German and Italian, and for two admirable chapters, XIII and XIV, on the Latin Lyric (including love-poetry) and problems touching its descent and its relation to vernacular songs. This part of the work includes an account of the famous collection which has been entitled *Carmina Burana*, and which represents the alluring and often haunting movements of some of the best rhymed poetry of medievalism.

The chronicle itself cannot always be confined to secular poetry; for instance, such a discussion as that on Venantius Fortunatus inevitably takes cognisance of his hymns and mystical poems where the throne of God replaces Olympus. The historical background is not neg-

lected; indeed, it is constantly kept in view to explain periods of intellectual exhaustion or resuscitation. The documentation is ample, and students are sure to be grateful for the excellent bibliography. Mr. Raby has been lavish with quotations illustrative of the qualities ascribed to authors in his criticisms. He does not disguise the poorness of some of the examples: we have to endure no little weakness in grammatical form (*vatorum* or *brevis est tempus*), in syntax, in prosody, and frequent monotony, baldness, and lack of inspiration; yet there is an abiding interest in the development of rhythmic Latin poetry from uncouth beginnings to the music which the great medieval centuries attained.

A few points invite comment. Paulus Albarus' *Vox, filomela, tua* is called (i. 235) 'the first nightingale poem,' but a cross-reference is due to Eugenius' triple use of the same phrase (i. 151), and to Alcuin's piece *Quae te dextra mihi rapuit, luscinia?* (i. 184). Modoin's 'Nectilus' does not strictly appear in Calpurnius and Nemesianus (i. 204 n. 2); for the correct form is 'Nyctilus.' In reference to Ermoldus' mention of 'Macer' in a ninth-century poem, Manitius is cited (i. 222 n. 1) as doubting whether Macer's poems survived to Carolingian times. On this it might be observed that in the *Disticha Catonis*, II. *prologue*, he is among the poets recommended for study, and as the *Disticha* had a wide educational vogue, this looks as if Macer may have still been available; if, however, his works had disappeared since the *Disticha* were collected, the very mention of his name would explain Ermoldus' allusion. Apropos of 'Cato,' attention might have been drawn to Columbanus' amplification of his *Dicta*, and it would have been worth while to annotate, in illustration of the continuance of educational tradition, what must be a reference to this famous handbook in the Carolingian verses about King Charles (p. 201 n. 2), the line *inclita nam superat praecleari dicta Catonis*.

A book giving so much valuable information deserves a more complete

inde
have
poin
Hor
dral
to V
der
com

Leky
lig
L.
(A
An
dr
St
A
m
THE
the
whit
wou
Min
pier
that
egg
is in
expl
lik
and
'Ae
part
egg
deve
ther
fater
love
the
pith
and
trip
are
shap
mea
ther
tion
A li
the
boo
idea
sent
Dra
Gra
gest
zu
ihne
revi
of a
thin
whe
desi
cret
beg
ing
writ

index. It would have helped greatly to have fuller entries indicative of such points as the continued influence of Horace, Ovid, Martial, and the cathedral schools; and a reference is needed to Walter of Châtillon's epic on Alexander discussed ii. 72-80. But such a complaint cannot blind a reader to the

generous scale of treatment followed in the body of the work. Gratitude for this arouses a keen desire to see Renaissance Latin poetry treated in a work of similar proportions, judgement and erudition.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Lekythos; archäologische, sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, von L. J. ELFERINK. Pp. 96, with 8 plates. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Universiteit van Amsterdam. Archaeologisch-historische Bijdragen, uitgegeven door Professor Dr. G. A. S. Snijder en Professor Dr. D. Cohen. II.) Amsterdam: Noord-hollandsche Uitgeversmij, 1934. Cloth, fl. 4.90.

THE central idea of this book seems to be that the egg is a symbol of life and rebirth. The white lekythoi placed on graves the author would derive archaeologically from the series of Minoan rhytons, of which the earliest is a pierced ostrich-egg, though Evans' series shows that already in Late Minoan II the original egg-shape entirely disappeared. This attempt is in fact no more successful than his proposed explanation of the word *lekýthos*. He couples *λίχνθος* and *λέκθος*, *yolk of an egg*, together, and suggests that they both spring from an 'Aegean' word meaning *egg*. In the latter part of the book the lekythos drops out, but the egg and its symbolism are still more fully developed. In the fifth shaft-grave at Mycenae there is an ostrich-egg rhyton decorated with faience dolphins. The dolphin is the symbol of love and of the womb: at about this point in the book Jung's name begins to appear. Grave pitthoi seem to the author to be egg-shaped, and these sometimes supported tripods: the tripod is a symbol of rebirth. Grave lekythoi are white, because this is the colour of the egg-shaped marble omphalos. The name Delphi means *womb*, and on p. 75 we are told that there can hardly be any doubt about the equation Δελφοί (sic) = Πυθώ = *womb* (*Gebärmutter*). A little later we have the universe presented in the form of an egg, though at the end of the book the egg becomes merely one of a series of ideas connected with motherhood, and the last sentence is: *Wir finden also: Delphin und Drache, Dreifuss und Pitthos, Ei, Omphalos und Grab, alle als Muttergleichniss. Die Vielgestaltigkeit verrät am unzweideutigsten das zu Grunde liegende, die Mutter, denn: 'von ihnen sprechen ist Verlegenheit,' and the present reviewer is equally puzzled to know what to say of an author to whom so many quite different things all come to mean much the same thing, whether it be an egg, or a *Gebärmutter*, or the desire for rebirth after death. The one concrete line of argument with which the book begins, that the lekythos is in form and meaning pre-Hellenic, is soon lost in this mass of writing about symbolism, clouds resting, it is*

only just to end by saying, upon piled-up mountains of erudition and footnotes.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Oxford.

C. ZIJDERVELD, JR.: *Τελετή: Bijdrage tot de kennis der religieuze terminologie in het Grieksch*. Pp. 2 + 109. Purmerend: J. Muusses, 1934. Paper.

THIS is another of those useful lexicographical contributions to our knowledge of Greek religion, and incidentally Greek philosophy, which are appearing successively from the pens of Professor Bolkestein and his pupils, Zijderveld being of their number. He argues persuasively, supporting his thesis by a large and well-chosen assortment of examples, that the lexica are wrong in supposing *τελετή* to mean primarily an initiation or mystery-rite. Etymologically, it implies no such thing, since it is one of the nouns corresponding to the vb. *τελεῖν*, and so should signify in its primary usage something like 'performance,' 'accomplishment (of some action).' This meaning, however, seems to occur only in the last line of the *Batrachomyomachia*, and therefore is of too uncertain date to be of much use. Apart from this, we find it used, before Alexander, of religious observances of all kinds, including quasi-religious festivals such as the Games. After Alexander, it tends to indicate that the observance in question has some peculiar, secret or symbolic features, and so is used especially of mysteries, though it seems never to be confined to this sense, and takes several derived meanings, such as 'secret or esoteric doctrine,' 'sect holding a peculiar doctrine or performing a peculiar rite.' Hence Jewish and Christian writers, when not using it to mean a pagan ceremonial or the like, can employ it of such things as the doctrines of the Torah, especially the allegorical teachings which Philon and others found therein, and the Christian Eucharist.

For those who fancy themselves unable to read plain and simple Dutch (a feat presenting no difficulties to anyone with a working knowledge of German) a summary in good English is appended.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

GIUSEPPINA LOMBARDO: *Cimone. Ricostruzione della biografia e discussioni storiografiche*. Pp. 174. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1934. Paper, 45 lire.

SIGNORINA LOMBARDO was once a pupil of De Sanctis, and seems to have learnt from him

the doctrine that there is no 'contingency' in historical events (cp. his *Problemi di Storia Antica*, pp. 113-5). This was bound to influence adversely her estimate of Kimon, for in both domestic and foreign affairs he advocated policies which were in the end unsuccessful. It is easy to represent him as the conservative idealist, blind to the logical development of events, but it may be doubted whether the adoption of policies opposed to his proved more beneficial to Athens. The authoress tries in c. 2 to find in the circumstances of Kimon's boyhood psychological explanations for his hostility to Persia and his friendship with Sparta, but fails to prove her case.

In detail she accepts from De Sanctis his 'explanation' of Persian policy just before the Eurymedon and his improbable dating of the Egyptian expedition to 458-2. Her discussion of Kimon's liberality in c. 4 is too ingenious. The odd statement (p. 31) that the Delian League was a league of democracies in the seventies occurs in close connection with the view, now fashionable but unsupported by evidence, that Themistocles was in favour of democracy. It is assumed too easily in c. 7 that Kimon was in command at Karystos and Naxos. The story of the Spartan promise to Thasos (Thuc. I. 101) is rejected on p. 96 but apparently accepted as historical later (p. 140 n. 2). Most of these are unimportant errors; Signorina Lombardo is usually accurate on questions of detail and sound in her judgments about them.

The life of Kimon has received so much attention from scholars that it offers little scope for originality; the novel views here propounded are of slight importance and inadequately argued. The thesis is a careful survey of the ancient evidence and most of the modern literature (some was perhaps too recent for inclusion, e.g. the inscription in *Hesperia*, Vol. II., p. 494). The appendix contains a useful survey of the ancient sources and a valuable analysis of Plutarch's biography of Kimon, and estimates at their proper value the results of the modern 'source-seekers.' Throughout the book the necessary discussions of detail are kept within reasonable limits, and the subject receives that breadth of treatment which its importance demands.

C. HIGNETT.

Hertford College, Oxford.

ROSE ZAHN: *Die erste Periklesrede* (Thukydides I 140-144). Interpretation u. Versuch einer Einordnung in den Zusammenhang des Werkes. Pp. iv + 116. Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1934. Paper.

MORE than one German dissertation has recently been dedicated to a single speech of Thucydides: e.g. Landmann on IV 59 ff. (C.R. xlvii 65), Oppenheimer on II 35 ff. (C.R. xlviii 86). Now Z.'s book, a considerable part of which is from Jacoby's pen, deals with Pericles' war-speech.

The 35 pages of 'Interpretation,' with 40 pages of wordy notes, often mis-referenced, scarcely bring one observation that an attentive reader could not have made himself. The main prob-

lem is, why Pericles practically ignores the Spartan ultimatum (139. 3) 'Autonomy for Greece,' and concentrates instead on the Megarian decree and other earlier issues (139. 1-2). Besides Pasquali's surgical solution in *St. It. N.S.* 5, 299 ff., an article on this point by Nesselhauf (*Hermes* 69, 286 ff.) appeared contemporaneously with Z., but failed to advance beyond Schwartz's brief but trenchant explanations (*Geschichtswerk* 131 n. 1), that (i) 139. 3 is *not* in our sense an ultimatum; (ii) the popular ascription of the war to the Megarian decree demanded refutation; and yet (iii) Pericles' speech had to come at the climax, and embrace the whole situation. Z. (6 f., 53, 90, 113 f.), without referring to Schwartz, elaborates (ii) and (iii); but as the apparent contradiction is already inherent in the *narrative* (139, 145), the true solution seems to be (i).¹

On the composition-problem, Z. (i.e. Jacoby), after criticizing Pohlenz's theory (I, 120 ff., 140 ff. *early*~1, 68-86 *late*), establishes the principle that there may be late matter in speeches basically early—J. himself probably intends giving us work on this line before long—and claims 140. 2-141. 1 + 144. 2 as representing the original 'early' speech, the rest being late additions contemporary with the Pericles-passages in II and a revision of I, 68-86. But when all the 'late' parts have been removed from I, 68-86, 120 ff., 140 ff.—and they include those very cross-references from which Z. argues the presence of the six speeches in an early draft!—nothing remains but ghosts of speeches: the theory commits suicide. The Pericles-speech itself is reduced to a mere six sections. Incidentally, Z. ignores the significance of 145, which contains the *ἐμπασα γνώμη*, jotted down provisionally before Pericles' speech was worked up.

There are errors Jacoby should not have passed. Ox. P. 1245 has the four words it is said to omit (72), and no other papyrus contains the passage. *ἀμαθῶς* 140. 1 (*ἐνδέχεται τὰς ξυμφορὰς . . . ἀμαθῶς χωρήσαι*) is taken (13, 76 ff.) not as passive, 'inscrutably,' but active, 'unreasonably' (*ἀμαθία* & *ξυνεσις*). True, *ἀμαθῶς* passive is unique²; but Z.'s explanation implies that *ξυμφοραὶ* often *can* be *ξυνεραῖ*! That *ρύχη* always has the article in T. (81) would be interesting if true; but see I, 144. 4; II, 42. 4; III, 49. 4; IV, 3. 1; 18. 5; 73. 3; V, 16. 1; 37. 3; 75. 3; 111. 3; 113. 1; VII, 33. 6; 67. 4; 68. 1. Will the Germans ever learn to spell Liddell's name (79, 94, 97)?

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

P.-M. SCHUHL: *Essai sur la formation de la pensée grecque*. Pp. 467. Paris: Alcan, 1934. Paper, 50 fr.

MR. SCHUHL covers the whole range of Greek thought, religious and philosophical, from the

¹ A point hitherto neglected: *τελευταίος*, unlike Eng. 'last,' can only imply what in the event *proved* final, not what was *intended* to be final.

² Cf. however I, 21. 1 *ἀπίστος ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνευκτικῶτα* (Shilleto).

earliest times to the end of the fifth century. An introduction stresses the importance of relating our study of the religion of Greece to what we know of its neighbours and to the discoveries of archaeology, but Mr. Schuhl does not adopt any of the more extreme theories of oriental influence. The first book is devoted to survivals of primitive thought in various practices and beliefs of the classical period, e.g. in the legislation of Plato's *Laws*; the second deals mainly with the religion of Crete and its share in forming the religion of Homer. Mr. Schuhl holds that many of the Olympians are developments of different aspects of the Cretan goddess and her son or consort; this is probably the most disputable part of the book, but lies outside the competence of the present reviewer.

The rest of the book traces the two main lines of Greek thought, rationalizing and mystic, to their union in Plato. Two hundred pages allow only a somewhat summary treatment, but a large number of topics are touched upon which often find no place in histories of Greek philosophy in the strict sense. The second part of book V, which deals with the mental atmosphere of Periclean Athens, is particularly good.

There are a few rather surprising omissions. No mention is made of possible mythical pre-conceptions in the Milesians other than their use of the word *debs*; and no hint is given of the notorious difficulty of reconciling Anaxagoras' principle of homoeomereity with the dictum that 'there is a portion of everything in everything'; Cornford's solution is assumed that the first 'everything' refers to qualities, not substances. Most surprising of all, in a book whose sub-title is 'Introduction historique à une étude de la philosophie platonicienne', there are only two casual references to Socrates.

Mr. Schuhl's learning is immense, and it is no disparagement of his book to say that to scholars the most useful part of it will be the notes and the bibliographical index. Modern authors alone occupy fifty pages, and some perhaps might have been spared; few nowadays, for example, will be tempted to adopt the views of Gladisch, a typical example of whose numerous works is entitled *Anaxagoras und die Israeliten*. Mr. Schuhl is indeed to be congratulated on his thoroughness, and his is a sensible and useful book. W. HAMILTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

seems to me to distort the artistic evidence. It is absurd, for instance, to speak of the 'archaic' art of Polygnotus (p. 9). Apollodorus is dated to the end of the fifth century, but he must have been working at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war (p. 10). 'Plato seems to set the ancients up against the moderns' (p. 13): but what is the evidence? A very good case has been made that Plato in fact preferred the moderns, the new Sicyonian school, with their emphasis on composition, proportion, and outline, to the illusionists of the fifth century (cf. R. G. Steven, *C.Q.* 1933, p. 153 f.). There is little evidence for an archaizing school to which M. Schuhl devotes an appendix and none for Plato's appreciation of it. M. Schuhl finds only the rudiments of perspective in vases and reliefs till the end of the fifth century (p. 31). This is an understatement: in spite of the limitations of pot-form and technique there are many instances of three-quarter faces and bodies from 480 B.C. onwards, to say nothing of boxes, jugs, shields, etc. Finally the passage of the *Sophist* quoted on p. 6 f. only refers to the optical illusion necessary in colossal statues and cannot be applied to the difference between the Polyclitan and Lysippean Canons, for both were sculpting real men but men of different proportions.

My criticisms are however solely directed against M. Schuhl's interpretation of the archaeological evidence. He has made an extremely useful collection of the relevant passages of Plato and has discussed a number of passages from other authors which bear on them. His appendices on *τὸ ἀκονιστικόν*, the empirical origin of modern perspective, Gorgias and the aesthetic of illusion, expressionism in the *Memorabilia*, Plato and the technique of the arts are excellent.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

P. TREVES: *Licurgo, L'Orazione contro Leocrate*. Introduzione e Commento. Pp. 186. Milan: Signorelli, 1934. Paper, L. 8.

THIS is a companion volume to the edition of Demosthenes' *de Corona* which was recently reviewed in these columns (p. 131), and its general characteristics are the same. The Introduction is interesting and adequate. The differences between Demosthenes and Lycurgus are satisfactorily described and explained, and other important points are well brought out—the strong religious (even fanatical) tone of Lycurgus, the influence upon him of Isocrates, the homiletic manner of his Speech, the principles of his policy and finance. The Commentary is perhaps unnecessarily full. Almost every word has its note, and translations are given of even the most familiar words and expressions, as if the work were intended for beginners without dictionaries. But the notes on the historical, political and ethical significance of the expressions used by Lycurgus are often very good, though there is some unnecessary moralizing. There are some mistakes which seem to show an imperfect acquaintance with ordinary Greek idioms, e.g. in § 9 *τοῦτω καρὲν χροόμενος* is ren-

PIERRE-MAXIME SCHUHL: *Platon et l'Art de son temps (Arts plastiques)*. Pp. 123. Paris: Alcan, 1933. Paper, 20 fr.

THIS book purports to show that when Plato refers to art he is thinking of artists of his own time. But the author does not face the question, Who were the artists of Plato's own time? It must be remembered that Plato was born in 427 B.C., and therefore the illusionistic painting which he particularly criticises was the established style from his earliest youth. In fact there is nothing about painting in the *Republic* which is inconsistent with its dramatic date. There are several places where M. Schuhl

dered as if it were *τοῦτω τῷ κανόνι*: in § 12 *κάλλιστον ἔχοντες τῶν Ἑλλήνων παράδειγμα* is treated as if the words were *τοῖς Ἑλλήσι*: in § 138 *λελήθασιν ὑμῶς* is translated as if it meant 'forget.' Other passages in which the true meaning has been missed are § 17, in which *ἀφορῶν* does not mean 'looking back at,' but 'seeing from far off' (at sea): § 18, *τὰ πλοῖα καθήγον*, which means 'drove merchant-vessels to land,' to rob them of their cargoes (as often in Demosthenes): § 22 *τοὺς ἐράνοὺς διενεγκεῖν* (see Petrie's note *ad loc.*): § 55, where *πυθάνομαι* is more than *credo*, not merely 'accompanied': § 85, in which *ἔχοντες διετέλουν* is said to be a mere circumlocution for *εἶχον*: § 107, line 31, in which *εὐ διαβᾶς* is translated 'striding boldly forward'—which is inconsistent with *στηριχθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς*: § 140, where *εἰςδεδωκότων* is more than 'contributors.' Occasionally a difficult word needs a fuller note—e.g. *φιδάνθρωπον* in § 3, *φιλοτίμως* in § 15, *νεμεσητόν* in § 107. Durrbach's text is followed, but notes on variations and difficulties of reading are urgently required at § 100, line 44 of the passage of Euripides: § 109, *ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡπλοῖς*: § 116, *ὅσπερ γὰρ ἐμφύτων*. The note on *κλητεύσομεν* is very inadequate, and in § 86 the difficulties in *κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ὑποδύοντα* are not discussed. Reference to Petrie's excellent edition of the Speech (Cambridge, 1922), which the editor does not mention, would have saved him a number of mistakes, and suggested a better treatment of several passages. There are a number of misprints in the Greek text. But the editor is interesting and illuminating whenever he is dealing with questions of history, or with personal character and policy: and the defects in his Greek scholarship, though easily discerned, are not nearly so conspicuous as in his edition of the *de Corona*.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

OTTO RIETH: *Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* (Problemata, Heft 9.) Pp. x+209. Berlin: Weidmann, 1933. Paper, RM. 14.

THIS book is an important study of one aspect of Stoicism. The conception of Stoicism as a kind of religion which disguised itself as a complete philosophy by irrelevantly assuming the more useless parts of Aristotle's logic and certain peculiar metaphysical doctrines is here attacked from a new point. The credit of showing the novelty of the Stoic logic is due to M. Bréhier. Dr. Rieth takes the Stoic treatment of the conceptions *ποιόν*, *βίον*, *ποιότης*, *διάθεσις*, *ἔξις*, *σχέσις*, *αἰτιον*, and of the categories, and shows how it interlocks with their ethical theory. These are the 'Grundbegriffe' of his title. It may be considered a somewhat paradoxical one, but the truth remains that we cannot understand the Chrysippean system unless these conceptions are given their proper prominence. Dr. Rieth expounds his interpretations with lucidity and a thorough grasp of his material. It is an indication of both merits that at the end of the book are twelve excursus

in twenty-six pages of small type, including a valuable one on *σημείον*. I do not think that he has always said the last word, but he is always worth reading.

Our chief source of information on the topics of this book is Simplicius. Dr. Rieth, who sees Stoicism to be post-Aristotelian philosophically as well as temporally, hopes that his work may prove of value to the study of Peripateticism. These Stoic doctrines, he argues, were a criticism of Aristotle: they were in turn criticised by Peripatetics: but the Peripatetics interpreted their master in a way different from that they would have taken had there not been the rival system. He also hopes, perhaps with more justification, that by establishing the orthodox Chrysippean system he will make easier the study of Posidonius, from which he began his investigations. It is to be hoped that he will himself be able to attack the undergrowth of the Poseidoniosforschung. His sober judgment, absence of *parti pris*, and ability to marshal complicated evidence fit him for the Herculean task.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

DR. C. J. VOYVS: *Lexicon Philodemum.* Pars Prior. Pp. viii+179. Purmerend: Muusses, 1934. Paper, fl. 2.90.

THIS is a singularly reticent work. There is no prefatory matter except a brief *Conspectus Signorum*. The rest is an index of Greek words, with references, and with a Latin rendering of each at the beginning of the article. This *Pars Prior* reaches the end of κ. It appears that Dr. Voovs has indexed all the tracts by Philodemus which have been separately published. On the other hand he has completely ignored the further stores of material to be found in periodicals or in works like (if there is any work like) Crönert's *Kolotes und Menedemos*. This restriction of range makes the *Lexicon* less useful than it might be. Thus for Philo's poetical vocabulary he cites Jensen's text of Book V (without mentioning that it is Book V), and Hausrath's text of Book II (again without mentioning the Book); but he takes no notice of the very important fragments presented by Gomperz, mostly from papp. 994 and 1676, in his *Philodem und die Aesthetischen Schriften der Herkulanischen Bibliothek* (Vienna Acad. Sitzb. 1891). Similarly for the ethical vocabulary he takes no note of pap. 1251, which was published by Comparetti, under the impression that it was by Epicurus, in the *Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica*, 1885. He has also taken no account of the fragments of Philodemus contained in Vogliano's recent *Epicuri et Epicureorum Scripta* (1928). Even pap. 1457 (part of the *Περὶ Κακῶν*), which was published in full by Bassi in 1914, in the first fascicule of the abortive Third Collection of Herculaniensis, seems to have no reference in his pages.

Generally this is a useful work and reliable within its limits. It would have saved the compilers of the new edition of Liddell and Scott a great deal of trouble if it had come out sooner. But it is a pity that the author did not attempt

to complete his task by including the less accessible material. J. L. STOCKS.

University of Manchester.

N. LEWIS: *L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Égypte Gréco-Romaine*. Pp. xiii + 187.

Paris: Rodstein, 1934. Paper, 25 fr.

DR. LEWIS tells us all about papyrus, where the plant grew and when, what use could be made of its different parts, and how the writing material was prepared; he shows that the work must have been done near where the reed was cut, as it dries very quickly and goes brown. How Fannius at Rome turned the fourth-rate *charta amphitheatrica* into a good material he does not explain, but insists that it was only *remanée*. The author then goes on to show that the plant required definite care; when that ceased it died out in Egypt. Under the Ptolemies the makers had to supply the state with their best product, the sale of which was a state monopoly: under the Romans the industry was freer, but subject to manufacturers paying for a license and an excise-duty; after the Antonines they had also to furnish for the state's use the *anaboticum*, a definite proportion of their product. It was probably this papyrus that bore the famous protocol in accordance with Justinian's *Novel*, XLIV. 2.

To me the most interesting thing in the book was the new light thrown upon the question of the price of writing-papyrus. *P. Cairo Zenon*, I. 59054, 46-47 speaks of fifty *χάρτας πεντηκοντακόλλους*, 'rolls each made up of fifty sheets pasted together.' If *χάρτης* = a roll we can understand the passage in the Erechtheum accounts which speaks of *σανίδες δύο* for their rough copy at a drachma each and *χάρται δύο* for the fair copies at 1 dr. 2 ob. each, about a shilling. This has generally been rendered two sheets, making the price very high. But Dr. Lewis shows that a roll cost rather more than a day-labourer's wage, even several times more, but that, though not as cheap as modern paper, papyrus was not extremely dear. This is a relief to anyone who considers how enormous the consumption must have been.—There are too many misprints. E. H. MINNS.

Cambridge.

Études de Papyrologie, tome deuxième, premier fascicule. Pp. 1-72, 1 plate. (Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie.) Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1933. Piastres 16.

THE outstanding article in a very interesting number of this new periodical is the first, in which Professor A. E. R. Boak publishes seven early Byzantine papyri from Karanis. The first of these is a text of primary importance; it is nothing less than a copy of the edict of the prefect of Egypt publishing the imperial decree of Diocletian and his colleagues, by which, in A.D. 297, the new system of taxation was established. It proves once for all, against the denial of Seeck, that the *capitatio humana* was introduced into Egypt as well as the

iugatio: πόσα οὖν ἐκάστη ἀρούρα πρὸς τὴν πούττηρα τῆς γῆς ἐπεβλήθη καὶ πόσα ἐκάστη κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀγροικῶν καὶ ἀπὸ ποίας ἡλικίας μέχ[ρ]ει π[ο]ίας. There are a few slips in the text given, which require correction: l. 12 l. πούττῃσθαι for ποιήσθαι; l. 13 l. τὰ before εἰς; l. 20 l. ε' for ε'.¹ The second text, dated A.D. 298, is one of the early declarations of property (olive-trees) made under the new regulations.

This article is followed by a publication, by Collart and Jouguet, of an interesting petition which arises out of the disturbed conditions attending one of the frequent revolts of the Thebaid—the editors think, in about 160-150 B.C. Ch. Kuentz adds Egyptological notes on the personal names. E. Berneker follows with notes on various texts of the Ptolemaic period concerning legal processes, and the number ends with a brief article by Ch. Kuentz on some Arabic technical terms of irrigation.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

GRETE ROSENBERGER: *Griechische Privatbriefe*. (Papyri Iandanae, fasciculus sextus.) Pp. 215-258; 4 collotype facsimiles. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper. RM. 4.

THIS is the sixth part of a series which began as long ago as 1912; it is to be hoped that a part containing indices to the volume will not be much longer delayed. This instalment consists entirely of private letters, ranging in date from the third century B.C. to the sixth or seventh of our era, and most of them contain points of interest. Thus, 101 and 128 are good examples of Vulgar Greek, 97 is a most amusing abusive letter (note l. 4 f.: οὐκ εἰμι ἀπονενομημένος καὶ θῆκ[ε] εἰμι ἀναίσχυντος καὶ οὐκ [εἰ]μι μὴς !), and 122 contains a reference to Britain (there is another, missed by the editor, in P. Lond. 878). No. 102 would be important as giving the only sixth-century papyrus mention of Justinian's *ἀερικόν* if the editor's reading could be maintained, but it is almost certainly wrong. The formulae of the letter make against so late a date (so too with 129 and 130), nor does the context well suit a tax. The writer has muddled the word, but the late Professor Hunt correctly recognized *ἀβροαχοῦ*. In 99, 13 f. read probably *ἐθῆλωσά σοι τὸν αἶνον τῆς Σεντώ*.

The editor has done her work well. Her chief faults are an excess of commentary (a common error in editors of small collections) and a tendency to jump too hastily to conclusions (e.g. there seems no adequate reason to think 91 is from Zenon). But she shows wide reading and marked ability as a decipherer. The plates are good. H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

¹ These corrections are taken from my own text of the papyrus, copied from a photograph two years ago.

E. MAYSER: *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Band II 3: Satzlehre. Synthetischer Teil. Pp. vi+265. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1934. Paper, M. 36 (bound, 37.50).

THIS, the concluding, part of Mayser's immense work, which unlike the previous one has a separate pagination, deals with the sentence as a whole. It is planned with the same systematic thoroughness as its predecessors, dealing first with the formally regular simple sentence (I, 'Subjekt und Prädikat'; II, 'Kongruenz'), then with the formally regular compound sentence (I, substantival sentences; II, adjectival sentences; III, adverbial sentences; IV, 'Grenzverschiebungen zwischen regierenden und abhängigen Sätzen'), thirdly with particles, fourthly with parentheses, and finally with anacoluthon. At the end are a subject index, an index of Greek words, and an index of the more important passages discussed. There is the same wealth of illustration as in previous parts, and the volume makes a worthy completion to one of the most painstaking and elaborate pieces of research which the Greek papyri have yet inspired. H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

SIR GEORGE HILL: *Treasure-Trove*. The Law and Practice of Antiquity. Pp. 59. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIX.) London: Milford, 1933. Paper, 3s. 6d.

TREASURE found in England generally consists of Roman coins, so that the law of treasure-trove is more familiar to numismatists than to lawyers. The former Keeper of the Coins at the British Museum—now the Director—here gives us 'the first section of a comprehensive work on Treasure-Trove, its Law and Administration, from antiquity to the present time.' He sets out the few facts known about Greek and Roman law and practice, supplemented by the guesses of scholars, and embellished with anecdotes ancient and modern. Classical students should be interested in the story of Calpurnius Siculus, Nemesianus, and the care-free ploughman. The pamphlet is leisurely, scholarly, and readable.

P. W. DUFF.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ANTON FREDERIK VAN KATWIJK: *Lexicon Commodianicum, cum introductione de Commodiani vita, temporibus, sermone*. Pp. xxx+188. Amsterdam: Portielje, 1934. Paper.

A LEXICON to Commodian was badly needed, as the very full index in Dombart's edition (Vienna, 1887) does not enable one to prove a negative. The author deserves the gratitude of all students of the later Latin for the thorough manner in which he has performed his task, and they will consult his book constantly.

He was not so well inspired, however, in writing the introduction. To place Commodian in his proper setting demands not only a knowledge of Commodian, but of church history and of Christian Latin authors in general. To

acquire this knowledge requires a long apprenticeship, and the author does not appear to have read widely enough even in what relates to Commodian himself. Our two greatest English authorities on Christian Latin both expressed themselves in vol. xxiv of the *C.R.* (1910) quite definitely in favour of Brewer's fifth-century dating: Prof. John E. B. Mayor on pp. 240-1, 'Ernst Maass . . . proves Commodian's acquaintance with Firmicus Maternus . . . the conclusive argument of the learned Jesuit Brewer. . . . Some months ago I read, with entire concurrence as to the poet's date, *Commodian von Gaza* etc.'; Prof. E. W. Watson on p. 95, 'Commodian, who is now happily relegated to another country and a later generation than Augustine's.' But Dutch scholars will persist in neglecting English work. Mayor also asserted quite positively (p. 240) that *gaseus* is *gasaesus* and = *arcarius gasae*, 'keeper of the church treasure.' Van Katwijk's statements about the two manuscripts are also quite out of date: C is Berlin lat. Philippus 1825 and is assigned to saec. viii-ix (not saec. xi); and M, which was in the possession of Mr A. Chester Beatty till May 1933, was then purchased for the British Museum, where it is Add. MS 43460. A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

HUMPHRY TREVELYAN: *The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism*. Pp. xii+108. London: Longmans, 1934. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

MR. TREVELYAN has written a book of considerable general interest upon what would appear at first sight to be a specialist subject. This is because it is the background of Goethe's age and not the poet himself that is under consideration. As far as Goethe is concerned, the finding is almost entirely negative. The rebirth of Hellenism in Germany came in his age, but too late to influence him. It is not only students of German literature who will find importance in the story of this rebirth. Mr. Trevelyan gives a clear account of the effect of utilitarianism and of the rationalistic and pietistic schools upon classical studies in Germany during the first half of the eighteenth century and has many illuminating quotations. For example, a decree on the regulation of the Prussian schools contains these words: 'No one shall be admitted to the highest class of the great Lateinschulen, unless he can construe an easy classical author, such as Cornelius Nepos, whenever it may happen to be opened, making only occasional grammatical mistakes; no one shall be admitted in *primam Graecani* who has not at least the declensions and the regular verb at his command, and can also construe the first ten chapters of the New Testament.' He then traces the rise of the new Humanism (in the teaching of such pioneers as Gesner, Ernesti, J. F. Christ and Heyne) up to the appearance of Winckelmann. The course of his analysis embraces the various types of Hel-

¹ Apparently of Veronese origin (Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, p. 447): M may possibly have been the first part of C (Lindsay, p. 452).

lenism current both in France and in Germany during the century.

There are two statements which suggest (perhaps unfairly) limitations in Mr. Trevelyan's classical knowledge: p. 49, '... he also used Hygin's *Fabelbuch*, a very full Latin collection, dating from the sixteenth century'; p. 62, 'This tale ... is supported by only one reference, to a certain Tzetzen "in Lycophron."'

R. W. MOORE.

Shrewsbury School.

Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche, particularly of his connection with Greek literature and thought. By A. H. J. KNIGHT. Pp. vii + 194. Cambridge: University Press, 1933. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

FROM 1869 to 1879 Nietzsche was Professor of Classical Philology at Basel University, and the list of his classical lectures and publications is an impressive one. And Mr. Knight maintains that the leading inspirations of his philosophy are to be found in his study of Greek (especially pre-Socratic) literature, and that this is an influence which the critics have unduly neglected. Mr. Knight takes in turn the three cardinal points of Nietzsche's *Weltanschauung* ('the philosophy of Dionysus,' the eternal Recurrence, and the *Wille zur Macht*) and, independently of any admission that Nietzsche himself may make of his indebtedness, considers how far such doctrines are to be found, explicit or implicit, in Greek writers. Certainly for all three abundant precedent can be found. For Dionysus the inspiration is too obvious to need much indication; the eternal Recurrence theory involves interesting but inconclusive speculations whether any ancient philosophers except the Pythagoreans and Stoics believed that the universe moves in identical cycles; and the Superman takes one back to a survey of Greek politics, tragedy and mythology through the eyes of a Thucydides. Nietzsche will not always admit his debts (Mr.

Knight has more than one occasion to question his honesty), but the parallels are impressive. We are grateful to Mr. Knight for the generous scale of his quotations, and there are many aspects which go to make his book an excellent critical study of Nietzsche's philosophy as a whole, but to classical readers the main interest lies in Nietzsche's refutation of the false conceptions of Hellenism propagated by Winckelmann and the 'Weimar classicists.' The debt which the modern world owes Nietzsche for prompting a revaluation of the older 'archaic' Greece is here well suggested.

R. W. MOORE.

Shrewsbury School.

K. KUYPERS: *Der Zeichen- und Wortbegriff im Denken Augustins*. Pp. viii + 99. Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1934. Paper, fl. 1.90.

THIS work is mainly concerned with Augustine's *De Magistro*, and justification for considering it here lies in the fact that Dr. Kuypers relates Augustine's teaching to that of Greek philosophy. The work is divided into seven chapters entitled respectively: 'Der Zusammenhang von "De Magistro" mit den vorgehenden Schriften Augustins,' 'De Magistro,' 'Die Memoria-Lehre und der Wort- und Sachbegriff,' 'Credere und intelligere,' 'Vox und Verbum,' 'Zeichen, Institut und Kulturbegriff,' 'Sache und Wortbedeutung als Symbolon.' The work shows thought, care and insight; but it is certainly astonishing in the chapter 'Credere und intelligere' to find not one single reference to the cardinal Scripture text, Isaiah vii 9, 'nisi credideritis, non intellegitis' (= LXX), which exercised a most powerful influence on Christian thought, quoted as it is by Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, Ambrose, and Augustine himself (frequently), etc.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVII, NOS. 21-27. APRIL-MAY, 1934.

E. Adelaide Hahn, *Poetic Justice in the Aeneid* (concluded). Death is the wages of many sins, such as perfidy, violence and cruelty. C. Knapp, *Doctoral Dissertations in Classics, Columbia University, 1885-1933*. Id., *The Reading of Latin*. Reprints the introduction of I. Flagg, *Nepos*, 1895, which recommends a training in reading Latin aloud before (and often without) translation. Bertha C. Fortner, *Cicero's Town and Country Houses*. Two town houses, eight villae, and three or four lodges (deversoria). LaRue van Hook, *Deification and Cicero's de Lege Manilia*. C's language about Pompey shows a prevailing Roman mood to accept the divine hero and helps to explain Caesar-worship. Id., *The Praise of Athens in Greek Tragedy*. Repels a charge that the dramatists betrayed their artistic ideals and flattered their audience for the sake of the prize. Id., *Charcoal in Ancient Greece*. Alice E. Kober, *Some Remarks on Color in Greek Poetry*. Greek poets show an annoying inability to observe colours, and seldom describe nature. E. J. Urch, *Primary and Recent Secondary Sources for the Study of Roman Law* (two articles). Describes contents of the best editions and books. Mary L. Hess, *The*

Secondary Schools of Germany with special Reference to the Teaching and Study of Latin and Greek. Gertrude Hirst, *Archaeological Note on Juv. VI* 486-504. Compares the style of headdress in various busts and statues. A. R. Wightman and C. Knapp, *Cicero in Cat. I* 1. quem . . . arbitraris? has been strangely misconceived as 'anyone,' but that would be quemquam. *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals XIV.* Russel M. Geer, *An early Roman Loan Bank.* Livy VII. 21. 7 and 27. 3. Various writers note modern parallels to Lucr. III. 1057-67 (Roman ennu), the making of a fire in *Aen. I*. 176, the view of education in Aul. Gell. I. 9. 8-12, etc.

REVIEWS. J. T. Allen, *Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and their Influence*, New York, 1927. Admirable introduction, and sensible on the origins of drama (LaRue van Hook). J. C. Lawson, *Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, Cambridge, 1932. Needless radical revision of text (Id.). Anne C. E. Allinson, *Selected Essays*, New York, 1933. Favourable (J. W. Spaeth, Jr.).

VOL. XXVIII, NOS. 1-5. OCTOBER, 1934.

E. S. McCartney, *Greek and Roman Weather Lore of two destructive Agents, Hail and Drought* (four articles). D. B. Kaufman, *An Introduction to a First Century Polymath.* Life of Pliny the Elder and summary of Book VII (anthropology). J. W. Spaeth, Jr., *Verg. Georg. I*. 497. The *grandia ossa* of a soldier seven feet tall found in S. Italy. H. L. Levy, *Claudian B.G.* 546-7. Several anagrams of the word Roma are worked into these lines. J. S. Carberry, *Another Catullus to another Lesbia.* A Q. Catullus mourns his Lesbia on an urn in the Museo delle Terme. Id., *Queen Elizabeth quotes Horace.* Really Publius, mistaken for H. T. W. Valentine, *The Rising of Cold Again.* The passages quoted by Oldfather in *C.W.* XXVI. 99 are explicable by experiences of temperature inversion. S. E. Bassett, *Nonnus, Dionysiaca* 18. 5-19. 11. Staphylus evidently dies of alcoholism taught by Dionysus. *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals I-IV.* Modern parallels are noted for Verginius writing his own epitaph, elm leaves as cattle fodder, Cato's advice on buying a farm, etc.

GNOMON.

X. 8. AUGUST, 1934.

F. Hampl: *Der König der Makedonen* [Diss. Leipzig, 1934. Pp. 87] (Kahrstedt). H. furthers our knowledge of the most powerful Greek state. W. Kranz: *Stasimon* [C.R. XLVIII. 62] (Nestle). An unsatisfactory first chapter is more than redeemed by the excellence of the rest of the book. J. A. Schuurms: *De poetica vocabulorum abusione apud Aeschylum* [C.R. XLVIII. 63] (Snell). Contains much important linguistic information. H. Payne: *Necrocorinthia* [Oxford: Clar. Press, 1931. Pp. xii + 363, 199 illustrations, 53 plates] (Langlotz). L. reviews in detail, but admits that his criti-

cisms, even if new evidence supports them, hardly detract from the high value of the book. K. Preisendanz: *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung* [C.R. XLVIII. 141] (Kortenbeutel). Obvious defects mar a book which would be indispensable if revised. J. G. Winter: *Life and Letters in the Papyri* [Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1933. Pp. viii + 308] (Rosenberger). Largely unoriginal, but very helpful for non-specialists. *Διηγήσεις δι' ποιημάτων Callimaco in un papiro di Tebtynis* a cura di M. Norsa e G. Vitelli [Florence: Ariani, 1934. Pp. 61, 1 plate 4°] (Maas). M. surveys and comments on the new discoveries. A. Degraffi: *Abitati preistorici e Romani nell' agro Capodistria e il sito dell' antica Egidia* [Parenzo: Coana, 1933. Pp. 44] (Messerschmidt). Helpful and instructive. F. W. Shipley: *Agrippa's building activities in Rome* [C.R. XLVIII. 151] (Huelsen). H. argues one controversial point but approves the book as a whole. C. Patsch: *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa. 6: Die einstige Siedlungsdichte des illyrischen Karstes* [SBWien. Phil. hist. Kl. 215, 3 (1933)] (Rau). The second part is of great interest to the historian. R. O. Steuer: *Myrrhe und Stakte* [Vienna: Höfels in Komm., 1933. Pp. 48] (Schlesinger). St. strengthens the tradition represented by Theophrastus. L. Dalmasso: *La vite e il vino nella letteratura Romana* [Milan: Gualdoni, 1932. Pp. 124 4°] (Kroll). Good on the whole.—Obituary notice of Arthur S. Hunt by U. Wilcken.—Bibliographical Supplement 1934, No. 4 (down to July 31).

X. 9. SEPTEMBER, 1934.

A. Riegl: *Gesammelte Aufsätze.* Ed. K. M. Swoboda [Augsburg: Filser, 1929. Pp. xl + 206, 24 plates 4°] (Matz). R.'s work illustrates an older archaeological method, which may be not without use to-day. G. Säfllund: *Le mura di Roma repubblicana* [C.R. XLVI. 220] (v. Gerkan). Criticised at length, but placed among the most important recent books on the topography of Rome. *Zum Problem der Foruminschrift unter dem Lapis Niger.* (1) F. Leifer: *Zwei neuere Lösungsvorschläge*, (2) E. Goldmann: *Deutungsversuch* [C.R. XLVII. 87] (Weinstock). No satisfactory solution of the problem is offered. W. Kolbe: *Thukydides im Lichte der Urkunden* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930. Pp. iv + 104] (Kakridis). Kolbe attempts to establish some dates without much success. W. J. Woodhouse: *King Agis of Sparta and his campaign in Arcadia in 418 B.C.* [C.R. XLVII. 240] (Kromayer). A useless recapitulation of W.'s article in the *Annual of the B.S.A.* 1916-17. W. J. Oates: *The influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace* [C.R. XLVII. 87] (Jacoby). Does not amount to much. P. Ammann: *Der künstlerische Aufbau von Tacitus Hist. I 12-II 51* [C.R. XLVI. 187] (Drexler). A.'s book shows up the weakness of the modern but false approach to Tacitus. E. Benz: *Marius Victorinus und die Entwicklung der abendländischen Willensmetaphysik* [C.R. XLVII. 86] (Theiler). Original, but immature and undisciplined. *Plini Caecili Secundi Ebstulæ.* Ed. M. Schuster [C.R.

XLVIII. 80] (Kroll). A useful text, but many notes might with advantage have been omitted. *Thasci Caecili Cypriani de Mortalitate*. Commentary, introduction and translation by M. L. Hannan [Washington: Catholic Univ. of America, 1933] (Souter). Not without value, but often invites criticism. A. Wilhelm: *Griechische Grabinschriften aus Kleinasien* [SBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1932, 27] (Calder). A fresh monument of W.'s linguistic acumen and vast learning. C. questions some of his views. D. Sergejevski: *Rimski spomenici iz Bosne* [Belgrade, 1934. Pp. 28] (Diehl). Mostly gravestones, but sometimes instructive. A. Schulten: *Geschichte von Numantia* [Munich: Piloty and Loehle, 1933. Pp. 170, 11 maps, 13 illustrations] (Rau). A pleasant introduction to Sch.'s larger work. W. Wunderer: *Delphi* [Leipzig: Seeman, 1933. Pp. 143] (Zschietzschmann). Of questionable value either to travellers or to experts. H. Philippart: *Deux Vases Attiques inédits du Castello Sforzesco à Milan* [Paris: Leroux, 1933. Pp. 9, 5 illustrations] (Lippold). L. describes contents. *Izvestija na Bulgarskija Archeologiceski Institut*, 6 and 7 [Sofia, 1932-33] (Schede). Sch. gives a descriptive table of contents. A. Apostolaki: *ΤΑ ΚΟΙΝΤΙΚΑ ΤΑΞΕΜΑΤΑ ΤΟΤ ΕΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΣ ΜΟΤΣΕΙΟΤ ΚΟΣΜΗΤΙΚΟΝ ΤΕΧΝΟΝ* [Athens: Estia, 1932. Pp. 203, 2 plates, 163 illustrations] (Zuntz). Enriches the catalogues of Coptic material in Europe.—Obituary notice of Oscar Leuze by W. Theiler.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1934.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Hérodote, Histoires, Livre I*. Texte ét. et trad. par Ph. E. Legrand [C.R. XLVII, 134] (C. Fries). Vol. I contains text and translation, Vol. II a detailed introduction to H.'s life and writings. The commentary, though rather scanty, is adequate and of excellent quality.—*Epicetetus. Het eerste boek van der Diatriben*. Inleiding, vertaling, en commentaar door Helena W. F. Stellwag [Amsterdam, 1933, Paris. Pp. xii+256] (B. Olsson). Introduction, translation, and detailed commentary, in which S. rightly uses the language of the N.T. for comparison; she might similarly have used the papyri more extensively. Shows wide reading.—A. Severyns, *Bacchylide, Essai biographique* [C.R. XLVII, 240] (E. Kalinka). Examines everything afresh and gains new results, though these cannot in the nature of things be regarded as certain. Important book.—*Sofocle, Aiace*. Introd. e comm. di M. Untersteiner [Milan, 1934. Pp. 321] (W. Morel). Valuable cargo mixed with regrettably much ballast.

LATIN LITERATURE.—B. Axelson, *Seneca-studien* [C.R. XLVIII, 79] (C. Hosius). Shows sound knowledge of S.'s language and thoughtful interpretation of the individual passages.—*Tertullianus, De cultu feminarum*. Inleiding, vertaling, en commentaar door W. Kok [C.R. XLVIII, 199] (A. Kraemer). Detailed introduction, translation into Dutch, and instructive commentary. Translation welcomed as filling a long-existing gap; commentary, apart from the

varied exegetical notes, is mainly grammatical and lexicographical.—*Cicéron, Traité du Destin*. Texte ét. et trad. par A. Yon [C.R. XLVIII, 135] (R. Philippson). Unusually detailed introduction, text with short but adequate critical notes, translation, appendix, and indices. Very successful edition, containing much that is new and good, though there are many points with which reviewer does not agree. Long review.

HISTORY.—R. J. Bonner, *Aspects of Athenian democracy* [Berkeley, 1933, Univ. Press] (T. Lenschau). Intended for the general reader. B. has exact knowledge of his subject and an exceptionally plastic power of description. Stimulating.—A. Heuss, *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik* [C.R. XLVIII, 152] (T. Lenschau). Disputes Täubler's view of a 'natural enmity' between Rome and foreign peoples, discusses 'deditio', and examines more particularly Rome's Eastern policy in 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.—M. Reinhold, *Marcus Agrippa. A biography* [C.R. XLVIII, 151] (F. Taeger). Unusually valuable work that will long remain the foundation of further research on Agrippa. Masterly command of ancient tradition and modern research.

ANTIQUITIES.—*Wörterbuch der Antike mit Berücksichtigung ihres Fortwirkens*. In Verbindung mit E. Bux und W. Schöne verfasst von H. Lamer [C.R. XLVIII, 37] (R. Wagner). Contains great variety of information. A book not merely to use for reference, but to read in.

METRE.—O. Skutsch, *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iamben kürzung* [C.R. XLVIII, 195] (A. Klotz). Welcomed as a careful study adding to our knowledge in a restricted field.

GEOGRAPHY.—R. Hennig, *Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos* [Leipzig, 1934, Teubner. Pp. circ. 100] (V. Heydemann). New and surprising results for ancient Mediterranean geography and civilization. Shows sound judgment, deep learning, and thoroughness in research.

ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY.—G. Méautis, *L'âme hellénique d'après les vases grecs* [C.R. XLVII, 127] (C. Döttling). Develops thesis that Greek vases have not only an aesthetic, but also an ethical value in the emotional reactions of beholders. Ingeniously interprets a number of vase-scenes.—W. Elliger, *Zur Entstehung und frühen Entwicklung der altchristlichen Bildkunst* [Leipzig, 1934, Dieterich. Pp. xii+284] (H. Koch). Meagreness of sources renders it impossible to get beyond ingenious conjectures and probabilities. E. exercises the necessary precaution and has thorough command of his material.—W. Wrede, *Attische Mauern* [Athens, 1933, Deutsches Archäol. Institut. Pp. 67, with 113 illustrations on plates and 10 figures] (A. von Gerkan). Collects in excellent illustrations material hitherto much scattered; very welcome. But reviewer disagrees with many of W.'s aesthetic judgments.—Mabel Gude, *A history of Olynthus* [C.R. XLVIII, 147] (T. Lenschau). Contains a collection of all literary and epigraphical evidence and a prosopography of all Olynthians, both very useful, together with a summary of the town's history.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

*. * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Albeggiani** (F.) *Aristotele. La Poetica.* Pp. cxxix + 144. Florence: "La Nuova Italia," 1934. Paper, L. 14.
- Allen** (P. S.) *Erasmus. Lectures and way-faring sketches.* Pp. xii + 216; photograph. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Amery** (L. S.) *The Stranger of the Ulysses.* Pp. 163. London: Jarrolds, 1934. Cloth, 5s.
- Balsdon** (J. P. V. D.) *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula).* Pp. xix + 243. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 10s.
- Brown** (R. M.) *A Study of the Scipionic Circle.* Pp. 96. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. 1.) 1934. Paper. Copies (\$1 each) from the authoress, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.
- Casson** (S.) *Progress of Archaeology.* Pp. xii + 111; 43 figures. London: Bell, 1934. Cloth, 6s.
- Deferrari** (R. J.) and **McGuire** (M. R. P.) *Saint Basil: The Letters.* With an English translation. In four volumes. IV. Pp. xv + 461. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Duff** (J. W. and A. M.) *Minor Latin Poets.* With introductions and English translations. Pp. xii + 838. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Edel** (A.) *Aristotle's Theory of the Infinite.* Pp. 102. New York (for sale at The Journal of Philosophy, Inc., 515 West 116th St.), 1934. Paper, \$1.
- Forbes** (R. J.) *Notes on the History of Ancient Roads and their Construction.* (Allard Pierson Stichting, Arch.-Hist. Bijdragen, III.) Pp. xi + 182. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-mij, 1934. Cloth.
- Fortgens** (H. W.) *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum, Theb. Lib. VI 1-295, interpretatus est H.W.F.* Pp. 147. Zutphen: Nauta, 1934. Paper.
- Giusti** (A.) *Antologia omerica. Iliade.* Pp. 233. Milan: Signorelli, 1934. Paper, L. 5.
- Giusti** (A.) *Dell' accento latino.* Pp. 22. Milan: Signorelli, 1934. Paper, L. 2.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XLV. Pp. 263. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1934. Cloth, 8s. 6d.**
- Hesperia. *Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.* Vol. III: No. 3. The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora. Fourth Report. Pp. 197-310; figures and plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press, 1933. Paper.**
- Hettich** (E. L.) and **Maitland** (A. G. C.) *Latin Fundamentals.* Revised edition. Pp. xvi + 389. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934. Cloth, \$2.25.
- Hooper** (W. D.) and **Ash** (H. B.) *M. Porcius Cato and M. Terentius Varro on Agriculture.* With an English translation. Pp. xxv + 543. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Hunt** (A. S.) and **Edgar** (C. C.) *Select papyri, with an English translation. In four volumes. II: Official documents.* Pp. xxxvii + 608. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Lockwood** (D. P.) *A Survey of Classical Roman Literature. Vol. I.* Pp. xvi + 334. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Mosley** (J. H.) *Valerius Flaccus. With an English translation.* Pp. xxi + 458. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Neophilologus* XX. 1. Groningen etc.: Wolters. Paper.
- Sinclair** (T. A.) *A History of Classical Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle.* Pp. viii + 421. London: Routledge, 1934. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Skahill** (B. H.) *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus.* Pp. xxiii + 273. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. III.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1934. Paper.
- Thuckeray** (H. St. J.) and **Marcus** (R.) *Josephus. With an English translation. In eight volumes. V: Jewish Antiquities, Books V-VIII.* Pp. ix + 811. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Villeneuve** (F.) *Horace, Epîtres. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.)* Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1934. Paper, 25 fr.
- Welles** (C. B.) *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy.* Pp. c + 405. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1934. Cloth.
- Wicksteed** (P. H.) and **Cornford** (F. M.) *Aristotle, The Physics. With an English translation. In two volumes. II.* Pp. viii + 440. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Wormald** (R. D.) *Sensim. A Systematic Course in Latin Unseen Translation. Book III.* Pp. 160. London: Arnold, 1934. Cloth, 3s.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Adcock (F. E.) on Gude's *A History of Olynthus*, 147
 Alexander (W. H.) on Braginton's *The Supernatural in Seneca's Tragedies*, 40
 Allan (D. J.) on Karpp's *Untersuchungen zur Philosophie des Eudoxos von Knidos* and Gohlke's *Die Entstehung der aristotelischen Lehrschriften*, 130. On Brink's *Stil und Form der pseudaristotelischen Magna Moralia* and Seligsohn's *Die Uebersetzung der ps.-aristotelischen Problemata durch Bartholomaeus von Messina*, 193
 Altheim's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (III), 39
 Amato's *La Rivolta di Catilina*, 227
 Anderson (J. G. C.) on Johnson's *Excavations at Minturnae* (II, Part I), 142. On Holmberg's *Zur Geschichte des Cursus Publicus*, 143
 Atkinson's *The Greek Language*, 16
 Axelson's *Senecastudien*, 79
 Babbitt's *Plutarch's Moralia* (III), 26
 Bailey (C.) on Way's and Foxley's translations of Lucretius, 75. On Jensen's *Ein neuer Brief Epikurs*, 87. On della Valle's *Tito Lucrezio Caro e l'Epicureismo Campano*, 150
 Baker's *Twelve Centuries of Rome*, 185
 Baldson (J. P. V. D.) on Greene's *The Achievement of Rome*, 155. On Momigliano's *Claudius, The Emperor and his Achievement*, 197
 Barratt (C.) on Forbes' *NEOI, A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations*, 194
 Batterbury's *Duodecim Fabulae*, 145
 Baty's *Liuy*, Book II, 1-40 : 33
 Baynes (N. H.) on Hartke's *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*, 42
 Beare (W.) on Brix-Niemeyer-Conrad's *Plautus, Trinummus*, 23. On Drexler's *Plautinische Akzentstudien*, 72. On Sturtevant's *Plautus, Pseudolus*, 74. The date of the *Casina*, 123. On Ernout's *Plaute, Comédies* (Tomes I, II), 185
 Beazley's *Campana Fragments in Florence*, 69
 Bell (H. I.) on Mayser's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (parts), 41, 150, 242. On *The Tebtunis Papyri* (III, Part I), 87. Obituary notice of A. S. Hunt, 117. On *Papyri from Tebtunis* (Part I), 149. On *Études de Papyrologie* (II i) and Rosenberger's *Griechische Privatbriefe*, 241
 Benton (S.) on Wace's *Chamber Tombs at Mycenae*, 84
 Bibliotheca Philologica Classica (1932), 49
 Bickermann's *Chronologie*, 191
 bidens, 212
 Bignone's *Teocrito, Studio Critico*, 194
 Blakeney's *Euripides, Alcestis*, 146
 Blomgren's *Studia Fortunatiana*, 42
 Boak's *Papyri from Tebtunis* (Part I), 149
 Bongenaar's *Isocrates' Trapexititus vertaald en toegelicht*, 193
 Bonner's *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 199
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 158, 203, 246
 Bosanquet (R. C.) on Collingwood Bruce and Collingwood's *The Handbook to the Roman Wall*, 154
 Bowra (C. M.) Simonides in the *Theognidea*, 2. On Jacoby's *Der homerische Apollonhymnos* and Dornseiff's *Die archaische Mythenerzählung*, 60. Two notes on Sappho, 126. On Marchesini's *Omero* and Meyer's *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, 191
 Braginton's *The Supernatural in Seneca's Tragedies*, 40
 Breitenbach's *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik*, 220
 Brink's *Stil und Form der pseudaristotelischen Magna Moralia*, 193
 Brix-Niemeyer-Conrad's *Plautus, Trinummus*, 23
 Buckler and Robinson's *Sardis* (VII. Greek and Latin Inscriptions, Part I), 68
 Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé (No. 43), 118
 Burkitt (F. C.) on Bonner's *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas*, 199
 Bury (E. G.) on Taylor's translation of Plato's *Laws*, 180
 Bury's edition of Plato's *Symposium*, 21 ; of Sextus Empiricus (I), 198
 Butler and Barber's *The elegies of Propertius edited with an introduction and commentary*, 136
 Calder (W. M.) on Lamer's *Wörterbuch der Antike*, 37
 Campbell (A. Y.) Aeschylus fragment 179 : 14. Horace *Epistles* I, ii, 31 : 51
 Carcopino's *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain*, 195
 Carr and Hadzits' *The Living Language, A Latin Book for Beginners*, 145
 carruca dormitoria, 37
 Cary (M.) on Walbank's *Aratos of Sicyon*, 36. On Schlesinger's *Die griechische Asylie and Tarn's Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*, 86. On Reinhold's *Marcus Agrippa* and Shipley's *Agrippa's Building Activities in Rome*, 151. On Heuss' *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der röm. Aussenpolitik*, 152. On Carcopino's *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain*, 195. On Amato's *La Rivolta di Catilina*, 227
 Casson (S.) on Hansen's *Early Civilization in Thessaly*, 67
 Chanter's *Music to the Alcestis of Euripides*, 85
 Chantaine's *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, 149
 Charlesworth (M. P.) on Hammond's *The Augustan Principate*, 144. On Waltz' *Sénèque: L'Apocoloquintose du divin Claude*, 197
 Cicero's conduct of the case *pro Roscio*, 13
 Clarke's *The Roman Fort at Cadder*, 154
 clarus Aquilo, 124, 170
 Classical Association's meeting, 1
 Classical Weekly summarized, 43, 91, 243
 Colin's *Le Discours d'Hypéride contre Démosthène*, 181
 Collingwood Bruce and Collingwood's *The Handbook to the Roman Wall*, 154
 Colson (F. H.) on d'Agostino's *Quintiliano: Il libro primo della I.O.*, 89. On Tracy's *Philo Judaeus and the Roman Principate*, 197
 Colson and Whittaker's *Philo with an English translation* (IV), 153
 Conway's *Ancient Italy and Modern Religion*, 133
 Conway, Johnson, and Whatmough's *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*, 183
 cor Enni, 50
 Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (U.S.A., fasc. 4), 191 ; (Yougoslavie, fasc. 1), 216
 Coxon (A. H.) on Souilhé's *L'énigme d'Empédocle*, 146
 Craig (J. D.) on Drexler's *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens*, 186
 Croft's *Extracts from Latin Poetry for Beginners and Easy Exercises in Latin Syntax*, 34
 d'Agostino's *M. Fabio Quintiliano: Il libro primo della I.O. con commento*, 89
 Dale (A. M.) on Rose's *Hygini Fabulae*, 196
 Dale (F. R.) and Henderson's *Paginas Primas*, 35
 Davison (J. A.) The authorship of the 'Leucippides' papyrus, 205
 Dawkins (E. M.) on Elferink's *Lekythos*, 237
 della Valle's *Tito Lucrezio Caro e l'Epicureismo Campano*, 150
 Denniston (J. D.) on Atkinson's *The Greek Language*, 16. On Forster and Webster's *An Anthology of Greek Prose*, 149. On Moxon's *Aristotle's Poetics*, etc., 192. On Breitenbach's *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik*, 220
 Denniston's *The Greek Particles*, 221
 de Vreese's *Augustinus en de Astrologie*, 154
 diprax 'Mrs Malaprop', 60
 Dodds' *Proclus: The Elements of Theology*, 140
 dormitor, 23

- Dornseiff's *Die archaische Mythenverzählung*, 60
 Drexler's *Plautinische Akzentstudien*, 72; his *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelfen und Plautus' Rudens*, 186
 Ducati's *Pontische Vasen*, 71
 Duckworth's *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*, 38
 Duff (A. M.) on Friess' *Beobachtungen über die Darstellungskunst Catulls, Kapnukajas' Catull und Phalaekos, Hezel's C. u. das griechische Epigramm*, and van Gelder's *De Woordherhaling bij Catullus*, 25. On Hamilton's *The Roman Way*, 81. On Wheeler's *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, 196
 Duff (J. D.) on Schuster's text of *Plinius Minor*, 80
 Duff (P. W.) on Sonnet's *Gaius Trebatius Testa*, 39. On Hill's *Treasure-Trove*, 242
 Dunabin (B. L.) Notes on Lewis and Short, 212
 Dundas (R. H.) *Thucydides VIII. 5. v.*: 167
 Düring's *Ptolemaios und Porphyrios über die Musik*, 231
 Elferink's *Lekythos: archäologische, sprachliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 237
 Emerita: *Boletín de lingüística y filología clásica* (No. 1), 49
 England und die Antike (Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg), 83
 Eriksson's *Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus*, 230
 Ernout's *Plaute, Comédies* (Tomes I, II), 185
Etudes de Papyrologie (t. 2, fasc. 1), 241
 Euenus, 2
 Eumenides and Oedipus Tyrannus, 170
 extimatio, 199
 Fairbanks' *Greek Art, the Basis of Later European Art*, 35
 Fargues' *Claudian: Etudes sur sa Poésie et son Temps and Claudien: Inuestives contre Eutrope*, 232
 Farnell, L. R., obituary notice of: 117
 Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*, 65
 Field (G. C.) on Rogers' *The Socratic Problem* and Hackforth's *The Composition of Plato's Apology*, 17
 Fitzhugh's *Aristotle and the Aryan Voice*, 90
 Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Teubner texts of Cicero, and Von's *Cicéron: Traité du Destin*, 135
fordus Cassianum, 14
 Forbes (C. A.) *NEOI: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations*, 194
 Forbes (P. B. R.) on Haag's *Platons Kratylos*, 43. On Marouzeau's *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*, 199
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Pfeiffer's *Virgils Buholika*, 39. On Oppermann's *Caesar, der Schriftsteller und sein Werk*, 88. On Schnelle's *Untersuchungen zu Catulls dichterischer Form*, 151. On Terzaghi's *C. Lucili Saturnarum Reliquiae*, 225
 Forster (E. S.) on Murison's rendering of the *Iliad* in English hexameters, 127. On van Groningen's *Aristote: Le second livre de l'Economique*, 148. On Young's translation of the Epigrams of Callimachus, 182. On Lathrop's *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman*, 190. On Bongenaar's *Isocrates' Trapeziticos vertaald en toegelicht*, 193
 Forster and Webster's *An Anthology of Greek Prose*, 149
 Fotheringham (J. K.) on Bickermann's *Chronologie*, 191
 Foxley's *Verse Translations from Lucretius*, 75
 Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (I), 24
 Fraser (J.) on Hermann's *Lautgesetz und Analogie*, 82. On Fitzhugh's *Aristotle and the Aryan Voice*, 90. On Lindblom's *Zur Frage der Entstehung des Alphabets*, 91. On Conway and others' *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy*, 183
 Friedrich's *Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik*, 229
 Friess' *Beobachtungen über die Darstellungskunst Catulls*, 25
 Fruechtel's Teubner texts of speeches of Cicero, 135
 Furlani's *Le Categorie e gli Ermenetici di Aristotele nella versione striaca di Giorgio delle Nazioni*, 147
 Gage's *Recherches sur les jeux séculaires*, 198
 Gardner's *Poet and Artist in Greece*, 69
 Gaselee (S.) on books upon Medieval and Renaissance Latin, 30. On Blomgren's *Studia Fortunatiana*, 42. On Wistrand's *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*, 148
 Geffcken's *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (2), 217
 Ghisalberti's *Giovanni di Garlandia: Integumenta Ovidii and Arnolfo d'Orléans*, 30
 Giles (A. F.) on Homo's *Le Haut-Empire*, 78. On Kornemann's *Staaten, Völker, Männer, aus der Geschichte des Altertums*, 215
 Gnomon summarized, 45, 92, 155, 201, 244
 Gohlke's *Die Entstehung der aristotelischen Lehrschriften*, 130
 Gomme (A. W.) on Headlam's *Election by Lot at Athens*, 64. On Ranulf's *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens* (II), 174
 Gow (A. S. F.) on Philippart's *Collections de Céramique grecque en Italie* (I), 36. The panpipe of Daphnis, 121. On Bignone's *Troicritio*, *Studio Critico* and Ziegler's *Das Hellenistische Epos*, 194
 Granger's edition and translation of Vitruvius (II), 228
 Greene's *The Achievement of Rome*, 155
 Greenwood (L. H. G.) on Martin's text of Lucretius, 226
 Gude's *A History of Olynthus*, 147
 Gudeman's *Aristoteles IIEPI HOIHTIKHE*, 223
 gugga, 212
 Haag's *Platons Kratylos*, 43
 Hackforth (R.) on Sykutris' *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, 147. Three notes on Aristotle, *Ethics*, Book III: 208
 Hackforth's *The Composition of Plato's Apology*, 17
 Halliday (W. R.) on Hocart's *The Progress of Man*, 90. On Nock's *Conversion*, 139
 Hamilton's (E.) *The Roman Way*, 81
 Hamilton (W.) on Schuhl's *Essai sur la formation de la pensée grecque*, 238
 Hammond's (M.) *The Augustan Principate in theory and practice during the Julio-Claudian period*, 144
 Hammond (N. G. L.) on Oldfather's *Diodorus of Sicily* (I), 153
 Hammond's memoir of Sir J. E. Sandys, 49
 Hansen's *Early Civilization in Thessaly*, 67
 Harder's *Platons Kraton*, 192
 Hardie (C. G.) on Gudeman's *Aristoteles IIEPI HOIHTIKHE*, 223
 Harrison (E.) on new texts of Plutarch, 26. On Liddell and Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon* (new edn., parts 6 and 7), 43. On England und die Antike (Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg), 83. On Tremblere's *The Elegies of Propertius in a reconditioned Text* (2nd edn.), 88. On Symbolae Osloenses (X, XI), *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (XLIII, XLIV), *Transactions . . . of the American Philological Association* (LXII, LXIII), *Yale Classical Studies* (II, III), 91
 Harry's *Greek Tragedy: Emendations, Interpretations, and Critical Notes* (I), 128
 Hartke's *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*, 42
 Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (XLIII, XLIV), 91
 Hasebroek's *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, 15
 Headlam ('Morley') *Election by Lot at Athens*, 64
 Hellmann's *Herodots Kroisos-Logos*, 129
 Hermann's *Lautgesetz und Analogie*, 82
 Hesperia (II 2), 49
 Heurtley (W. A.) on *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (Yugoslavie, fasc. 1), 216
 Heuss' *Die völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der römischen Aussenpolitik in republikanischer Zeit*, 152
 Hezel's *Catull und das griechische Epigramm*, 25
 Higham (T. F.) Ovid: some aspects of his character and aims, 105
 Hignett (G.) on Hellmann's *Herodots Kroisos-Logos*, 129. On Lombardo's *Cimone*, 237

- Hill's *Treasure-Trove. The Law and Practice of Antiquity*, 242
- Hirst (M. E.) *The Eumenides and the Oedipus Tyrannus*, 170. *Thucydides I*, 171
- Hocart's *The Progress of Man*, 90
- Hoeuf prize competition, 118
- Holmberg's *Zur Geschichte des Cursus Publicus*, 143
- Homo's *Le Haut-Empire*, 78
- horis, 212
- Housman (A. E.) *Ennius in Pers. VI 9: 50. On Butler and Barber's The elegies of Propertius edited with an introduction and commentary*, 136. *On Isaac's Martial: Epigrammes (II)*, 187
- Howland (B. L.) *on Harder's Platons Kriton*, 192
- Hrdlicka's *A Study of the Late Latin Vocabulary . . . in the Confessions of St. Augustine*, 154
- Hunt (A. B.) *on Preisendanz' Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung*, 141. *Obituary notice of A. S. H.*, 117
- Hunt and Smyly's *The Tebtunis Papyri (III, I)*, 87
- IPIZ (Vol. 21), 205
- Irvine's *Cicero's Correspondence*, 33
- Isaac's *Martial: Epigrammes (Tome II)*, 187
- Jacoby's *Der homerische Apollonhymnos*, 60
- Jaeger's *Poideia: Die Formung des griechischen Menschen*, 176; his *Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development*, 192
- Jax' *Die weibliche Schönheit in der griech. Dichtung*, 87
- Jensen's *Ein neuer Brief Epikurs wiederhergestellt und erklärt*, 87
- Johnson's *Excavations at Minturnae (II, Part I)*, 142
- Jones (W. H. S.) *on Rader's Oribasii Collectionum Medicarum Reliquiae (IV)*, 153
- Jones' *Pausanias, Description of Greece (III)*, 66
- Juhász' *Bibliotheca scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum*, 30
- Kapnukajas' *Catull und Phalaehos*, 25
- Karpp's *Untersuchungen zur Philosophie des Eudoxos von Knidos*, 130
- Kasten's text of *Cicero's pro L. Murena, pro Sulla*, 135
- Kellett's *A Short History of Religions*, 90
- Ker (A.) *on Scholte's P. Ovidii . . . Ex Ponto Liber Primus*, 152
- Kleingünther's *Πρότος Εὐπέρης*, 173
- Knight's (A. H. J.) *Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche*, 243
- Knight (W. F. J.) *Clarus Aquilo*, 124. *On Friedrich's Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik*, 229
- Knögel's *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*, 183
- Kok's *Tertullianus de Cultu Feminarum met Inleiding, Vertaling en Commentaar*, 199
- Korinna and Pindar, 8
- Kornemann's *Staaten, Völker, Männer, aus der Geschichte des Altertums*, 215
- Korver's *De Terminologie van het Crediet-Wezen in het Grieksch*, 200
- Kranz' *Stasimon*, 62
- Krieg's *De Euripidis Oreste*, 192
- Kroll's *Die Kultur der Ciceronischen Zeit (II)*, 134
- Kuypers' *Der Zeichen- und Wortbegriff im Denken Augustins*, 243
- Laidlaw (W. A.) *on Skutsch's Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenhüerzung*, 195
- Lamer's *Wörterbuch der Antike*, 37
- laridum, 213
- Lathrop's *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman*, 190
- Lawson (J. C.) *Notes on Aeschylus, Persae (I, 4: (II), 55*
- lectio difficilior, 171
- Leeper (A.), *obituary notice of*: 205
- Lemmi's *The Classical Notices in Bacon*, 90
- 'Leucippides' papyrus, the: 205
- Levi's *Ottaviano Capoparte*, 76
- Lewis and Short, *notes on*: 212
- Lewis (N.) *L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Egypte Gréco-Romaine*, 241
- Lewis (L. W. P.) and Goddard's *The First Two Years of Latin*, 34
- Liddell and Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon* (new edn., parts 6 and 7), 43
- Lindblom's *Zur Frage der Entstehung des Alphabets*, 91
- Lindsay (W. M.) *Diprax 'Mrs Malaprop'*, 60
- Lister (H.) *on some class-books*, 33. *On Peeters' A Bibliography of Vergil*, 88
- Lockwood's revised edition of *Smith's A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary*, 32
- lolium, 213
- Lombardo's *Cimone. Ricostruzione della biografia e discussioni storiografiche*, 237
- Lorimer (W. L.) *on Méridier's Platon (V 1, 2)*, 19. *On Bury's The Symposium of Plato*, 21. *On Furlani's Le Categorie e gli Ermenutici di Aristotele nella versione siriana di Giorgio delle Nazioni*, 147. *Lectio difficilior*, 171. *On Denniston's The Greek Particles*, 221
- Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores (Part I)*, 189
- Luckhurst (K. W.) *Note on Plato Charmides*, 153B: 207
- Lupton's *Selections from Vergil and Ovid*, 146
- Lyne's *Balbus*, 145
- Macdonald (G.) *on Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum (II i-ii)*, 37. *On Mattingly and Robinson's The Date of the Roman Denarius*, 89
- McEwan (R.) *on some class-books*, 145
- Macgregor (D. C.) *on van Manen's Περὶ ἐν Ἰλλοῦτος in de Periode na Alexander*, 149
- McKenzie (R.) *on Atkinson's The Greek Language*, 16. *On Chantaine's La formation des noms en grec ancien*, 149. *On Schwyzer's Griechische Grammatik (I. Lieferung)*, 179. *On Korver's De Terminologie van het Crediet-Wezen in het Grieksch*, 200
- Magie's *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae (III)*, 41
- Maginness (W. S.) *Pliny's Letters, X 87 3: 14 (cf. 60). On Yon's Ratio et les Mots de la Famille de reor*, 200. *Two notes on Cicero, De Senectute*: 211
- Marchant (E. G.) *on Oppenheimer's Zwei attische Epitaphien*, 86. *On Eriksson's Studien zu den Annalen des Tacitus*, 230
- Marchesini's *Omero: L' Iliade e l' Odissea*, 191
- Marouzeau's *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*, 199
- Martin's *T. Lucretii Cari de Rerum Natura libri sex*, 226
- Mattingly (H.) *Virgil's Golden Age: Sixth Aeneid and Fourth Eclogue*, 161. *On Baker's Twelve Centuries of Rome*, 185
- Mattingly and Robinson's *The Date of the Roman Denarius and Other Landmarks in Early Roman Coinage*, 89
- Mayser's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit (parts)*, 41, 150, 242
- melimelum, 213
- mendicabulum, 213
- Méridier's *Platon (V 1, 2)*, 19
- Meyer's *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, 191
- Meyerstein's *Four Elegies of Propertius done into Stanzaed English Verse as Experiments*, 40
- Mickwitz' *Die Systeme des römischen Silbergeldes im IV. Jhdt. n. Chr.*, 41
- Minns (E. H.) *on Lowe's Codices Latini Antiquiores (Part I)*, 189. *On Lewis' L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Egypte Gréco-Romaine*, 241
- Mnemosyne (new series), 49
- Momigliano's *Claudius, The Emperor and his Achievement*, 197
- Moore (R. W.) *on Trevelyan's The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism*, 242. *On Knight's Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche*, 243
- Morland's *Rufus De Podagra*, 42
- Morrison's *A School Latin Course (Part III)*, 35
- Moscrop's *Cicero, Pro L. Flacco*, 33
- Mountford (J. F.) *on Düring's Ptolemaios und Porphyrios über die Musik*, 231
- Moxon's *Aristotle's Poetics, Demetrius on Style, etc.*, 192

- Mure (G. R. G.)** on Jaeger's *Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development*, 192
- Murlison's** *The Iliad of Homer in English Hexameters*, 127
- Murray (G.)** on Kranz' *Stasimon*, 62
- Mylasa**, note on a decree from: 210
- Myres (J. L.)** on Kleingünther's *Ἰππότρος Εἰρηφία*, 173
- Myres' The Cretan Labyrinth: A Retrospect of Aegean Research, 171**
- Neryllinus**, 9
- Nestle's Griechische Religiosität vom Zeitalter des Perikles bis auf Aristoteles, 174**
- Nilsson (M. P.)** on Myres' *The Cretan Labyrinth*, 171
- Noble (P. S.)** on Walde-Hofmann's *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (5 and 6), 31; (7) 200
- Nock (A. D.)** on Dodds' *Proclus: The Elements of Theology*, 140. On Colson and Whittaker's *Philo* (IV), 153
- Nock's Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo, 139**
- nummus** in Plautus, 23
- O'Donnell's The Vocabulary of the Letters of Saint Gregory the Great, 199**
- Ogle and Schullian's Rudolfi Tortarii Carmina, 30**
- Oldfather's Diodorus of Sicily (I), 153**
- Ὀρούα and ὠπῶνα** in Euripides' *Helen*, 119
- Oppenheimer's Zwei attische Epitaphien, 86**
- Oppermann's Caesar, der Schriftsteller und sein Werk, 88**
- Ormerod (H. A.)** on Rose's *The Mediterranean in the Ancient World*, 72
- Ovid**: some aspects of his character and aims, 105
- Owen (A. S.)** on Schuurmsma's *De Poetica Vocabulorum Abusione apud Aeschylum*, 63. On Harry's *Greek Tragedy: Emendations, Interpretations, and Critical Notes* (I), 128. Letter on Horace, *Ep. I. 2*: 31: 158
- oxyptaderotinus*, 41
- Pagoto's Sulla posizione di Gela**, 36
- Palmer (L. R.)** on von Blumenthal's *Die Iguvinischen Tafeln*, 38
- panpipe** of Daphnis, 121
- papyrus codex**, 214
- Paton, Pohlenz, and Sieveking's text** of Plutarch *Moralia* (III), 26
- Payne (H. G. G.)** on Ducati's *Pontische Vasen*, 71
- Pearce (J. W. E.)** on Mickwitz' *Die Systeme des römischen Silbergeldes im IV. Jhdt. n. Chr.*, 41
- Peeters' A Bibliography of Vergil, 88**
- Pfeiffer's Virgils Bukohika, 39**
- Philippart's Collections de Céramique grecque en Italie, 36**
- Philologische Wochenschrift** summarized, 44, 93, 157, 202, 245
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.)** on Tièche's *Thespis*, 36. On Treves' *Demostene: L'Orazione per la Corona*, 131. On Colin's *Le Discours d'Hyperide contre Démosthène*, 181. On Treves' *Licurgo, L'Orazione contro Leocrate*, 239
- Pindar and Korinna**, 8
- Platnauer (M.)** on Vessereau and Préchac's *Rutilius Namatianus sur son retour*, 27
- Platonist or Aristotelian?** 97
- Plautus**: date of the *Casina*, 123
- Pope's Claudian: The Rape of Proserpine in English Verse, 232**
- Porteous (A. J. D.)** **Platonist or Aristotelian?** 97
- Potidaea**, battle at: 207
- Potter (K. B.)** on Meyerstein's *Four Elegies of Propertius done into Stanzas English Verse* and Turner's *The Old Gods*, 40
- Powell (J. E.)** The fate of the *fordus Cassianum*, 14. *Aristotle Politics II 9^a—2, 12=1274a 12: 59*. On Zahn's *Die erste Periklesrede*, 238
- Preisendanz' Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung, 141**
- proskynesis*, 168
- quaternio*, an early example of: 214.
- Quirk (R.)** Xenophon, *Hellenica I. vi. 32*: 214
- Raby's A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages**, 236
- Backham (H.)** *Aristotle, N.E. I. vi. 1, 1096a 14: 214*
- Raeder's Oribasii Collectionum Medicarum Reliquiae** (IV), 153
- Ramsay (W. M.)** *Neryllinus*, 9
- Ranulf's The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens** (II), 174
- Rehtia**, 184
- Reinhold's Marcus Agrippa**, 151
- Reis' Teubner texts** of speeches of Cicero, 135
- Richards (G. C.)** *Proskynesis*, 168
- Richardson's Old Age among the Ancient Greeks**, 87
- Richmond (I. A.)** on Pagoto's *Sulla posizione di Gela*, 36. On Van Buren's *A Bibliographical Guide to Latium and Southern Etruria* and *A Companion to the Study of Pompeii and Herculaneum*, 40
- Rieth's Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik**, 240
- Robertson (D. S.)** on Granger's edition and translation of Vitruvius (II), 228
- Robin's Platon, Phèdre**, 64
- Robinson's (C. E.) Everyday Life in Ancient Greece**, 33
- Robinson's (D. M.) Excavations at Olynthus** (V-VII), 22, 85, 132; his *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (U.S.A.), 4), 191
- Robinson (E. S. G.)** on Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus* (VI), 85
- Rogers' The Socratic Problem**, 17
- Rose (H. J.)** *Pindar and Korinna*, 8. On Altheim's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (III), 39. On Kellett's *A Short History of Religions* and Lemmi's *The Classical Deities in Bacon*, 90. Obituary notice of L. R. Farnell, 177. Two notes (*Theokritos XV*, 119; *Philostatos Senior, Imagines*, II, 19, 1), 126. On Conway's *Ancient Italy and Modern Religion*, 133. On Rouse's *Gods, Heroes and Men of Ancient Greece*, 146. *Ἀλφρηγεύνης Βοπήρ*, 170. On Nestle's *Griechische Religiosität vom Zeitalter des Perikles bis auf Aristoteles*, 174. On Gagé's *Recherches sur les jeux séculaires*, 198. On Schwenn's *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos*, 219. On Zijderfeld's *Telerh*, 237
- Rose's (H. J.) Hygini Fabulae**, 196; his *A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian*, 217
- Rose's (J. H.) The Mediterranean in the Ancient World**, 72
- Rosenberger's Griechische Privatbriefe**, 241
- Rouse's Gods, Heroes and Men of Ancient Greece**, 146
- Sandbach (F. H.)** on Duckworth's *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*, 38. On Bury's *Sextus Empiricus* (I), 198. On Rieth's *Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik*, 240
- Sandys (Sir J. E.)**, memoir of: 49
- Sanna's Bibliografia generale dell' età romana da Augusto a Giustiniano**, 1
- Sardis** (VII): Greek and Latin Inscriptions, Part I), 68
- Schlesinger's Die griechische Asylie**, 86
- Schmid-Stählin's Geschichte der griechischen Literatur** (I 2), 177
- Schnelle's Untersuchungen zu Catulls dichterischer Form**, 151
- Scholte's P. Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto Liber Primus**, 152
- Schuhl's Essai sur la formation de la pensée grecque**, 238; his *Platon et l'Art de son temps (Arts plastiques)*, 239
- Schuster's text** of Plinius Minor, 80
- Schuurmsma's De Poetica Vocabulorum Abusione apud Aeschylum**, 63
- Schwenn's Die Theogonie des Hesiodos**, 219
- Schwyzer's Griechische Grammatik** (1. Lieferung), 179
- Sedgwick (W. B.)** Cicero's conduct of the case *pro Roscio*, 13
- Seligsohn's Die Übersetzung der pt.-aristotelischen Problematik durch Bartholomaeus von Messina**, 193
- Seltman's Attic Vase-painting**, 69
- Semple (W. H.)** on Stevens' *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age*, 29. On Fargues' *Claudien: Etudes and Claudien: Inoectives contre Eutrope*, and Pope's *Claudien: The Rape of Proserpine in English Verse*, 232

- Shipley's *Agrippa's Building Activities in Rome*, 151
 Shirley's *Memorabilia Latina*, 35
 Simonides in the *Theognidea*, 2
 Sinclair (T. A.) on Schmid-Stählin's *Griechische Literatur* (I 2), 177. On Rose's *A Handbook of Greek Literature* and Geffcken's *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (2), 217
 Skard's *Ennius und Sallustius*, 38
 Skutsch's *Prosodische und metrische Gesetze der Iambenhierung*, 195
 Smith's *A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary* (ed. Lockwood), 32
 Solmsen (F.) 'Οροια and πρῆγρια in Euripides' *Helen*, 119. On Krieg's *De Euripidis Oreste*, 192
 Sonnet's *Gaius Trebatius Testa*, 39
 Souilhé's *L'énigme d'Empédocle*, 146
 Souter (A.) on Svoboda's *L'Esthétique de Saint Augustin et ses Sources* and Mørland's *Rufus De Podagra*, 42. On de Vreesse's *Augustinus en de Astrologie* and Hrdlicka's *A Study of the Late Latin Vocabulary . . . in the Confessions of St. Augustine*, 154. On Svennung's *Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen*, 155. On Kok's *Tertullianus de Cultu Feminarum* and O'Donnell's *The Vocabulary of the Letters of Saint Gregory the Great*, 199. A papyrus codex and an early example of 'quaternio', 214. On Wright's *Select Letters of St. Jerome*, 233. On van Katwijk's *Lexicon Commodianum*, 242. On Kuypers' *Der Zeichen- und Wortbegriff im Denken Augustins*, 243
 Stevens' *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age*, 29
 Stocks (J. L.) on Knögel's *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*, 183. On Vooyo's *Lexicon Philodemum* (Pars Prior), 240
 Stone (W. A.) Notes on Pindar, 165
 Strasburger's *Ptolemaios und Alexander*, 194
 Stuart Jones (H.) on Magie's *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (III), 41
 Sturtevant's *T. Macci Plauti Pseudolus*, 74
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 43, 91, 155, 201, 243
 Summers (W. C.) on Smith's *A Smaller Latin-English Dictionary* (ed. Lockwood), 32. On Axelsson's *Seneca Studien*, 79
 Svennung's *Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen*, 155
 Svoboda's *L'Esthétique de Saint Augustin et ses Sources*, 42
 Sykutris' *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, 147
 Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum (II, The Lloyd Collection, i-ii), 37
 Symbolas Osloenses (X-XII), 91
 Syme (R.) on Levi's *Ottaviano Capoparte*, 76
 Tarn (W. W.) on Hasebroek's *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, 15. On Strasburger's *Ptolemaios und Alexander*, 194
 Tarn's *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*, 86
 Tarrant (D.) on Robin's *Platon, Phèdre*, 64
 Tatham (M. T.) Horace, C. IV. 2. 57 ff.: 127
 Taylor's *The Laws of Plato translated*, 180
 Tebtunis Papyri (III, I), 87. *Papyri from Tebtunis* (I), 149
 Terzaghi's *C. Lucilii Saturnarum Reliquiae*, 225
 The Teaching of Latin and History (Report of a conference), 35
 The Year's Work in Classical Studies (1934) announced, 205
 Thomason's *The Priapea and Ovid*, 227
 Tièche's *Thespis*, 36
 Tillyard (H. J. W.) on Chanter's *Music to the Alcestis of Euripides*, 85
 Tod (M. N.) on Sardis (VII, Part I), 68
 Toynbee's *The Hadrianic School*, 197
 Tracy's *Philo Judaeus and the Roman Principate*, 197
 Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association (LXII, LXIII), 91
 Tremenheere's *The Elegies of Propertius in a reconditious Text* (2nd edition), 88
 Trevelyan's *The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism*, 242
 Treves' *Demostene: L' Orazione per la Corona*, 131; his *Licurgo, L' Orazioni contro Leocrate*, 239
 Turner's *The Old Gods*, 40
 Turolla's *Saggio sulla Poesia di Sofocle*, 85
 Van Buren's *A Bibliographical Guide to Latium and Southern Etruria and A Companion to the Study of Pompeii and Herculaneum*, 40
 van Gelder's *De Woordherhaling bij Catullus*, 25
 van Groningen's *Aristote: Le second livre de l'Economique*, 148
 van Katwijk's *Lexicon Commodianum, cum introductione* . . . 242
 van Manen's *Περὶ τοῦ Πλάτωνα ἐν τῇ Περιόδῳ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου*, 149
 Vessereau and Préchac's *Rutilius Namatianus sur son retour*, 27
 vestispica, 60
 Virgil's Golden Age: Sixth Aeneid and Fourth Eclogue, 161
 virillum, 23
 von Blumenthal's *Die Iguvinischen Tafeln*, 38
 Vooyo's *Lexicon Philodemum, Pars Prior*, 240
 Wace (A. J. B.) on Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus* (V), 22; (VII) 132
 Wace's *Chamber Tombs at Mycenae*, 84
 Walbank's *Aratos of Sicyn*, 36
 Walde-Hofmann's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (5, 6), 31; (7) 200
 Waltz' *Sénèque: L'Apolocoloquintose du divin Claude*, 197
 Warburg Institute, 118. *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 83
 Way's *Lucretius . . . in English Verse*, 75
 Webster (T. B. L.) on Fairbanks' *Greek Art*, 35. On Beazley's *Campana Fragments in Florence*, Gardner's *Poet and Artist in Greece* and Selman's *Attic Vase-painting*, 69. On Turolla's *Saggio sulla Poesia di Sofocle*, 85. On Jax' *Die weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung* and Richardson's *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks*, 87. On Jaeger's *Paideia*, 176. On Robinson's *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (U.S.A., 4), 191. On Toynbee's *The Hadrianic School*, 197. Letter on his edition of *Cicero pro Flacco*, 203. On Schuhl's *Platon et L'Art de son temps (Arts plastiques)*, 239
 Wheeler's *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, 196
 Whittick (G. C.) On Clarke's *The Roman Fort at Cadder*, 154
 Wifstrand's *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*, 148
 Wight Duff (J.) on Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (I), 24. On Kroll's *Die Kultur der Ciceronischen Zeit* (II), 134. On Thomason's *The Priapea and Ovid*, 227. On Raby's *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 236
 Wilhelm (A.) Note on a decree from Mylasa, 210
 Woodcock (E. C.) Tacitus, *Annals*, IV, 16, 2: 125
 Woodward (A. M.) on Ferguson's *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*, 65. On Jones' *Pausanias, Description of Greece* (III), 66
 Wormald's *Higher Certificate Latin Test Papers*, 146
 Wright's *Select Letters of St. Jerome with an English translation*, 233
 Wyllie (J. M.) on Skard's *Ennius und Sallustius*, 38
 Yale Classical Studies (II, III), 91
 Yon's *Cicerón: Traité du Destin*, 135; his *Ratio et les Mots de la Famille de reor*, 200
 Yon's *The Epigrams of Callimachus translated*, 182
 Zahn's *Die erste Periklesrede*, 238
 Ziegler's *Das Hellenistische Epos*, 194
 Ziegler and Lindskog's text of Plutarch's *Lives* (II fasc. I), 26
 Zijderfeld's *Teherā: Bijdrage tot de kennis der religieuze terminologie in het Grieksch*, 237

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—‘passim’ means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

- Aelian *NA* iv 4, *VH* xiii 25: 8
 Aeschylus *A.* 509: 128; 1019: 129; 1148: 128;
 1450: 4. *Ew.* 479, 802 f., 810-7, 903-10, 938-49:
 170. *Fr.* 179: 14. *Pers.* 159-60, 173 f., 211-4: 4 ff.;
 603-5, 628-32, 700-2, 813-7: 55 ff. 815: 128. 849 f.:
 55. *Supp.* 332: 129. *Th.* 705: 128
Anth. Pal. xi 362: 182
 Apuleius *Met.* 9 4: 213
 Aristotle *EN* 1096a 14: 214; 1112a 28, 1112b 28-31,
 1114b 23: 208 ff. *HA* 580a 15 ff.: 8. *Occ.* II
 1345b 27, 1346a 13, 1352b 26: 148. *Po.* 51b 21:
 225. *Pol.* 1247a 12: 59
 Arrian *An.* iv 10, 5-12, 5: 168
 Ausonius *Epist.* v 13-15: 54
 Bacchylides: see Simonides ('Leucippides')
 Callimachus *ap. Anth. Pal.* xi 362: 182
 Cassiodorus *ap. Pseudo-Primasium*, 214
 Cicero *De Fato* passim: 136. *De Sen.* ix 27, xx 72:
 211 f. *Balb.* 23=53: 14. *Caecil.* 82, *Clw.* 69, 107,
 143: 135. *Flacc.* 30, 40, 41: 135 f., 203. *Imp. Cn.*
Pomp. 3, 24: 135. *Leg. agr.* ii 59, 61, 71, iii 3: 135 f.
Mur. 42: 135. *Rab. perd.* v. 3: 135. *Rosc. Am.*
 126: 13
C.I.L. III 7071: 9
 Demetrius *On Style* passim: 192
 Ennius *ap. Pers.* vi 9: 50
 Euenus (?) = Theognis 467-96, 667-82, 1345-50: 2
 Euripides *Hel.* passim: 119. *Hipp.* 347, 1307: 221 f.
IA 1495: 220
 Herodotus iv 154: 221
 Hesiod *Th.* 127, 292, 459: 219
 Horace *Carm.* i 39 9-15: 4; iv 2 57 ff.: 127. *Epist.* i
 2 31: 51, 158
 Isocrates *Hel.* 1-2: 21
 Jerome *Letters* passim: 234 f.
 Lucilius *Saturae* passim: 225 f.
 Lucretius passim: 226
 Lycurgus *Leocr.* passim: 239 f.
M.A.M.A. I no. 1: 12
 Martial viii, ix passim: 188 f.
 Ovid *Am.* i 14 1-2, 45-50: 113. *Ars* ii 111-22: 116;
 iii 109-12: 114. *Ex P.* i passim: 152; iv 8 57-64:
 109. *Tr.* i 109-16: 114; iv 10 45-50: 108
Pap. Iandanae fasc. vi 99 13 f.: 241
 Pausanias vii 25 10: 67
 Persius vi 9-11: 50
 Philostratus senior *Imag.* ii 19 1: 126
 Pindar I. i 41: 166. *N.* i 24, iii 16 f., iv 86 ff., v 43,
 vii 50: 165 f. *O.* vi 89 f.: 8
 Plato *Chrm.* 153b: 207. *Cra.*, *Euthd.*, *Ion*, *Mx.*
 passim: 19 f. *Epin.* 976a: 222. *Lg.* passim: 180;
 898c: 222. *Smp.* 175b: 21; 220d, e: 207
 Plautus *Amph.* 103, 143, 149, 161, 524: 186. *Cas.* 5-19:
 123. *Potm.* 977: 212. *Pseud.* 336-9, 1196: 74.
Trin. 9, 105, 207, 413, 862, 888, 1177: 23. *Truc.*
 682: 60
 Pliny *Epist.* vi 2 9, 22 7: 81; x 87 3: 14; x 96 10: 81
 Plutarch *Aem.* 23 11: 26; *Alex.* 54: 168; *Cato* 14 fin.,
 51 fin.: 26; *Tim.* 11 2, 36 6: 26. *Mor.* 172-263 and
 384-612 passim: 26; 602c, d: 206
 Propertius passim: 136-9
 Quintilian *I.O.* i 1 28, 4 22: 89
Revue archéologique 1933 II p. 38 (decree from Mylasa):
 210
 Rutilius Namatianus passim: 27 ff.
 Sappho a 3. 5-8 and 'Επιθαλάμια 8 App. 5 f. (Lobel):
 126
 Seneca *Nat. Q.* i 16 1, ii 32 8, v 13 3, vi 1 9: 80.
Tragediae passim: 230
 Scriptorum Historiae Augustae III (Loeb) passim: 41
 Sextus Empiricus i 22: 198
 Simonides *Fr.* 4, 14, 72 (Diehl): 2; *Fr.* 24 (Diehl):
 4. Simonides (?), 'Leucippides' papyrus: 205
 Sophocles *Ant.* 414: 128; 466: 129. *El.* 21, 451, 493,
 569, 610, 1458: 128. *O.T.* 170, 806: 63. *Ph.* 1153:
 128; 1218 f.: 129
 Tacitus *Ann.* iv. 16 2: 125; ii 31, iv 5, xii 20: 231
 Terence *Ad.* 260 ff.: 187
 Theocritus i 128: 121; xvi, xvii (dates), 194; xv
 119: 126
 Theognidea 467-96, 667-82, 1345-50: 2-4
 Thucydides i 140 1: 238; i 141: 171; viii 5 5: 167
 Vergil *A.* vi and *E.* iv passim: 161-5. *G.* i 36 f.:
 162; 460-2: 124, 170
 Vitruvius vi-x passim: 228 f.
 Xenophon *Hel.* I vi 32: 214

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| αἰθηγενέτης, 170 | ἐποφελω, 167 | οὐκ οὐν in Plato, 221 |
| ἀίσω (ᾱ and ᾱ), 7 | εὐέντευκτος, 210 | οὐν with indefinite relatives, |
| ἀλλά, ἀλλ' ἐπερ, 221 f. | ἔγουν, 222 | 222 |
| ἄμαρτις, 4 | ἔπερ, 222 | πραίνω, 58 |
| ἄμνησις, 4 | κάθαρσις, 224 | προκύλισις, προσκύνησις, προσ- |
| ἀρα, ἀρα μή, ἀρ' οὐ, 221 | λίμνη, 43 | πίπτω, 168 ff. |
| αὐτουργός, 171 | μελίπνοις, 121 | τελετή, 237 |
| δέ, some uses of: 221 f. | ναυαρχία, 59 | τελευταίος, 238 |
| ἐγκλημα, ἐγκησις, 148 | δνομα, πᾶγμα, σῶμα, 119 ff. | χάρη, 241 |
| ἐπισημασία, 211 | οὐδέ (μηδέ), some uses of: 221 | |

43.

Mx.
80;

-19:
74-
rus.

: 81
fin.,
and

asa):

bel):

: 80.

: 41

ehl):
5
, 495.
1153:

31

; xv

x67

36 f.

atives,

, xpo-

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

List of Books published, 1934

Latin

277. } *Silius Italicus*. Translated by J. D. DUFF. In two volumes.
278. }
280. *Vitruvius. ON ARCHITECTURE*. Translated by F. GRANGER. In two volumes.—Vol. II.
283. *Cato and Varro, de Re Rustica*. Translated by W. D. HOOPER and H. B. ASH.
284. *Minor Latin Poets*. Translated by J. WIGHT DUFF and ARNOLD M. DUFF.
286. *Valerius Flaccus*. Translated by J. H. MOZLEY.

Greek

275. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. COLSON and the late G. H. WHITAKER. In nine volumes. Vol. V.
255. *Aristotle. PHYSICS*. Translated by PHILIP WICKSTEED and F. M. CORNFORD. Two volumes. Vol. II.
270. *S. Basil. THE LETTERS*. Translated by ROY DEFERRARI. Four volumes. Vol. IV.
281. *Josephus*. Translated by H. ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS. Eight volumes. Vol. V.
276. *Plato. REPUBLIC*. Translated by PAUL SHOREY. Two volumes. Vol. II.
282. *Select Papyri*. Translated by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR. Four volumes. Vol. II.

Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, 6s.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

An Ideal Gift for an Intelligent Child

Gods, Heroes and Men of Ancient Greece

By W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

The Rise and Fall of the Olympian Empire told for children of all ages by a scholar who never allows us to forget that he is a wit and a humorist. It would be an admirable addition to the school library, and an interesting prize book.

'Will serve for more than mere entertainment. It is good to find many of the best things in Pindar, Simonides, and others quietly incorporated.'—*Times*.

'Certain to enlighten and entertain many readers, old and young.'—*Punch*.

With 8 Illustrations by NORMAN HALL. 7s. 6d. net

JOHN MURRAY, 50, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

Murray's Classical Atlas For Schools

Edited by G. B. Grundy, M.A., D.Litt.

Consisting of 83 Maps and Plans. Folio (14½ x 9½ ins.). The maps in this atlas have been most carefully prepared so as to accentuate all the chief names and natural features of the countries. In the new edition all the maps have been thoroughly revised and some new contours have been added.

SECOND EDITION. 9s. net.

A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK & ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M.A. 25s. net

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

GREEK PARTICLES

By J. D. DENNISTON

25/- net

'... Mr Denniston is to be congratulated not merely because he has himself completed a great work of learning, but because he has shown how much work is still to be done in a language which is thought by some to have been overworked. ...'

Oxford Magazine

THE EMPEROR GAIUS

By J. P. V. D. BALSDON

10/- net

'... A valuable contribution to our understanding of Ancient Rome. ...'—*Daily Telegraph*

THE ROMAN WALL IN SCOTLAND

By SIR GEORGE MACDONALD

A new and revised edition 30/- net

'... His fascinating book ... is a triumph of patient scholarship.'—*Independent*

BYZANTINE ART

By D. TALBOT RICE

Illustrated 12/6 net

A short and practical but comprehensive introduction to the whole field of Byzantine Art (Shortly)

PROCLUS: THE ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY

A Revised Text

with Translation, Introduction and Commentary

By E. R. DODDS

30/- net

'... It is a work of the finest scholarship ... I do not know any finer edition of a Greek book. ...'

A. D. Nock in the *Classical Review*

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY

PRESS

